CHRONICA REGVM MANNIÆ ET INSVLARVM.

THE CHRONICLE OF MAN AND THE SUDREYS

EDITED FROM THE MANUSCRIPT CODEX IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM

AND WITH HISTORICAL NOTES

BY

P. A. MUNCH,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE ROYAL-UNIVERSITY
OF CHRISTIANIA; HON. F. R. A. S. S.

TO ACCOMPANY THE „INDEX SCHOLARUM" OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE YEAR 1857,
SECOND SEASON.

CHRISTIANIA 1860.

PRINTED BY BRØGGER & CHRISTIE.

PREFACE.

The Islands on the west coast of Scotland and England occupy an important place in the earlier pages of the Norwegian history, not only because of their having been, for about 170 years at least, if not for double that time, a part of the Norwegian kingdom, but also, because in the period when Norway itself was consolidated into one monarchy, and numbers of its citizens, disgusted with this new state of things contrary to their ideas of freedom and independence, sought new homes in foreign parts, these islands became, as it were, a kind of first *rendezvous* or central place, whence afterwards the emigrants themselves or their descendants in the first and the second degree, spread in various directions to form new settlements, never, however, ceasing to feel themselves as Norwegians, but carrying with them everywhere the language, manners and institutions of their original home, and keeping always up a connexion with the mother country, which generally, when stronger powers from without did not interfere, sooner or later ended in real dependency or political union. We know this at least to be the case with Iceland, the most important and interresting of all Norwegian settlements, the history and manner of whose colonization is accurately known from the *Landnámabók*. If we study this remarkable work thoroughly, we shall find, that of the four hundred chief settlers, who divided the whole Island between them, the greatest, or most powerful, or those who carried the largest families with them, did not come immediately from Norway, but from the western islands, whither they first made sail when emigrating from their ancient udal possessions in the old country. And even as to those, about whose fates during the time between their emigration from Norway and their arrival in Iceland nothing is told expressly, it is still somehow to be guessed, that they

passed some time in the western Islands or in Ireland at least in the first period of the colonization [1]. We find, thus, that not few of their slaves had Gaelic names, which shows that they were either Irishmen or Scottish highlanders [2]; some of the settlers themselves were even Irishmen or inhabitants of the western coasts of Scotland [3]; and what is still more remarkable, and, perhaps, gives the best evidence of the state of things here supposed, is, that the rearing and pasturing of sheep, the national and most important branch of livelihood in Iceland has never, not even in the times of the colonization, been like to anything in Norway, the mother-country, not even as far as regards the *termini technici*, while on the contrary it has all the chief and characteristic features of the same national occupation in Western Scotland and the Isles. From this circumstance we are indeed justified in concluding, almost to a certainty, that those settlers, who set the first example of rural economy in Iceland, and gave to the whole way of living its chief and lasting features, had passed time long enough on the Scottish coasts and the Isles, to become in a great measure nationalized there, and to adopt very much of the manners and customs prevailing among the inhabitants. Nor is it to be forgotten, that very likely the greater part of their servants, as already hinted, were natives of these countries, and that no doubt to their care the chief arrangement of the household was confided. To the Icelanders, therefore, the western Islands of Scotland, as in a certain degree the chief cradle of their race even more than the mother country Norway itself, ought to be of peculiar

[1] We distinguish between two chief periods of emigration to Iceland, the first immediately after the conquest of whole Norway by Harold Hárfagri, the second in his later days, or in the second or third generation afterwards, when the soil of Iceland had already for the most part been divided between the first settlers, and the more recent comers were obliged to buy their lands.

[2] As f. inst. *Malcolm* (Mælkólfr) *Duthac* (*Dufþakr*) etc.

[3] Among those are named Calman and his brother Cuilen (Kýlen) from the Isles, who settled near *Hvítá*, in the south-western part of the country, where the estate occupied by the former bears still his name - *Kalmanstunga*. Other names among the settlers, or their first descendants, sufficiently showing the Gaelic origin of the bearers, are Connal (*Kónáll*), Nial (*Njáll*), Becan, Melpatrick, etc.

interest, and are even to be looked upon by them with a sort of filial piety.

Iceland, however, is not the only Norwegian settlement to which the western Islands have been, as it were, a kind of stepping stone. As for Ireland, that is to say the Norwegian settlements and kingdoms at Dublin, Waterford and Limerick, we would affirm this at once as a matter of course, if the proximity of Ireland and the Islands did not make it likely, that both of them were visited by our ancestors at the same time, and settlements formed simultaneously on either side of the sea. Yet, as the Islands were situated on the way of the Norwegians to Ireland and therefore likely to be visited by them before the latter (while it seems to us evident as it shall be shown hereafter more circumstantially, that the Islands did not at any period contain large and lasting colonies, but rather an uncertain and fluctuating population of Norsemen, while in Ireland these became stationary for centuries), we think ourselves still entitled to regard the Irish colonies as subsequent to, and chiefly issuing from, the first settlements made by Norwegians in the Isles west of Scotland. From both, the Isles as well as Ireland, or perhaps chiefly from the former, the Isle of Man evidently got its Norwegian population, which, however, although strong enough, as we shall see, to leave many traces, even in the local denominations, did never, as in the Orkneys and Shetland, entirely absorbe the Gaelic population, which shows, that this island was likewise more a stepping stone for other settlements on a larger scale, than such a settlement itself. And here it is not difficult to trace the direction, which the flood of Norwegian emigrants took, after resting for a while on Man. From the middle of the ninth century, the eastern coasts of England, from East Anglia to the Scotch border, had been subjected to an incessant visitation by Vikings or emigrants from the *Danish* countries, belonging, it is true, to the same chief stem of nationality, as the Norwegians, but forming nevertheless a separate branch, with characteristic peculiarities enough to distinguish them from these. We suppose it to be known by every student of English or Northern history, and deem it therefore unnecessary to dwell at length upon here, how these Danish emigrants at last succeeded, not only in subjugating, a large portion, almost the north-eastern half of England, but also to introduce their language and nationality and to establish kingdoms, one of which lasted for a couple

generations, and even after having submitted to the kings of England, continued still for a long time to form a separate part of the empire, with the laws, institutions, and to a great extent even the language imparted to it by the powerful warriors from the shores of the Cattegat and the Belt [1]. For a long time, no distinction has been made between these northern settlers on the east coast of England and the Norsemen in Ireland and Scotland, but they have been named indiscriminately Danes or Normans and have generally been looked upon as belonging to one people. The more accurate study and knowledge of the old German dialects, however, begun and carried out by the great scholars of our times, and which have led to so many important ethnographical discoveries, unknown to and unlooked for by the linguists and ethnographers of the last century, has sufficiently pointed out the peculiar, however slight, distinctions between the two sister branches just mentioned, the Norsemen and the Danes, in the ninth and tenth century, and has enabled us to trace in the north-western and more mountainous districts of the Danish settlement in the north of England an influx of the Norwegian branch, from the shores of the Solway down to the eastern slope. And, indeed no more than this fact is needed to unveil the fact, that from the nucleus of Norwegian settlements in the Isles and Ireland, numbers of warriors have poured over to the coasts of Cumberland, until at last they met with their Danish brethren, and then, with a nationality almost identical, and having interests in common whith them against the former possessors of the soil, easily coalesced with them into one political and national body. It is the merit of Mr. Robert Fergusson, to have first pointed out this important fact to English readers, in his valuable book „The Northmen in Cumberland and Westmoreland"; while formerly, as just mentioned, no distinction was made between the Norwegian and Danish settlers in England, or, if even some names, characteristic of Norwegian nationality, were pointed out, still the Norwegians were believed to have arrived together with, or from the same direction, as the Danes. Mr. Fergusson has not only given many local names [1], which may be recognized at first

[1] For more minute and accurate information about this matter I refer to Mr. Worsaae's „Danes and Norwegians in England."

[2] F. inst. Natland, Morland, Birkthwaite, Micklethwaite, Seathwaite, Apple-

glance as exclusively Norwegian, in the north western part of Northumberland and the north of Cumberland, but also collected a list of words[1], still used in the dialects of those parts, the Norwegian origin of which is not to be mistaken. This result from merely linguistic researches is also entirely confirmed by historical records, to which in a certain degree it affords the explanations hitherto wanting. Among the Northumbrian kings named in the so called „Chronicon Saxonicum" and by the old English annalists, we find several who are said to have arrived from Ireland, and whom, indeed, we find in the Irish chronicles as kings of Dublin viz. Olaf Kvaran, one Sigtrygg (Sitric) etc. In the celebrated battle of Brunanburgh (938), Irish warriors are expressly stated to have fought; and in the beautiful old English poem describing it, the beaten warriors from Ireland are said to have returned to Dublin. Here, then, it is easy to see, that Man has formed the stepping stone, and that the possession of it must have been of the utmost importance to the Norwegian warriors, who came here, partly to form new settlements, partly to earn fame and booty by piratical exploits.

Even for Norsemen, who made their final settlements farther from the Scottish islands, these may be traced or at least supposed to have formed a favourite and much frequented haunt in the beginning of their career. It may now be regarded as pretty well ascertained, that the chief bulk of northern settlers, who occupied Normandy, belonged to the Danish branch, but were called Nortmen or Normans, because they issued originally from the southern part of Jutland, while still ruled by kings of Norwegian origin, and even sometimes being called Nortmannia. Rollo or Gangu-Rolf, the son of the Norwegian Earl Ragnvald, had only succeeded to the command of the whole fleet or union of piratical emigrants till more than a generation after its having for the first time left the shores of the Eider. But as a Norwegian, and a power-

thwaite, Rugthwaite, Blea Fell, Dun Fell, Hest Fell, all in the lake district of Cumberland, which are identical with the Norwegian „Natland, Morland, Birkethveit, Myklethveit, Siothveit, Eplethveit, Rugthveit, Bleefjeld, Dunfjeld, Hestfjeld."

[1] As - *amell* (ámilli), *Arvel* (erfi-öl), *bain* (beinn, i. e. straight), *batten* (batna - to improve, thrive), *beel* (belja), *boun* (búinn), *fleer* (flíra - i. e. sneer, laugh), *force* (fors, i. e. waterfall), *gowk* (gaukr), *gowl* (gaula), *gowpen* (gaupn i. e. handfull) etc.

ful one too, Rollo had no doubt frequented the Scottish isles and shores in his youth, before joining the great Danish fleet from „Nortmannia". And there is an evidence thereof in the fact, that in the aforesaid „Landnáma" a daughter of the same Rollo is mentioned, named Kathleen, who was, again, married to or had a daughter by the Scottish or perhaps rather Irish king Beolan, at a time, when Rollo must have been very young [1]. The name „Kathleen" and her marriage with Beolan is enough to prove, that she must have been born and lived in Ireland or somewhere in the Isles, and that it was here, Rollo became acquainted with her mother. And Rollo was certainly not the only Norwegian among the Normandy settlers who had begun his emigrating career with an expedition to the Isles of western Scotland.

As for the Orkneys, Shetland and the Færeys, their proximity to Norway makes it more likely that they were populated immediately from this country, than by Norsemen previously settled iu the western Islands. Yet that even there many of the colonists may have belonged to the latter class, is probable at least from the circumstance, that the general road to Iceland in the oldest times lay by these different groups of Islands, each of them being about a day's sailing from the other, and enabling thereby the sailors conveniently to shape their course. It is expressly stated of Aude daughter of Ketil Flatnef (of whom more anon), head of the noblest and most powerful family who settled in Iceland, that she took this course, leaving even one grand-daughter in Orkney, married to the Earl or Maormor of Caithness [2], another at the Færeys. In these last-named islands, moreover, we find the same culture of sheep, characteristic to Scottish influence, as in Iceland. We know even, that the sheep there are or were of the Scottish race, as Dicuilus tells us, that about 30 years before the Norwegian emigra-

[1] Landnáma II. 11. The daughter of Beolan and Kathleen, it is said, was ravished in Scotland by the Icelander Helgi, who married her, and had by her a son, whose daughter Gudrun was born about 980; Kathleen then, was born about 880.

[2] This grand-daughter, married to Duncan Earl of Caithness, was named *Gróa*, which name has been rendered *Gruach* in Gaelic records. It is very probable, that from this Gruach and her husband Duncan the far-famed Gruach Macbeth's Queen was descended, and had got her name.

tion, the Islands had been inhabited by some Scoto-irish Culdees [1], who brought sheep with them, but were compelled to flee through fear of the northern Vikings. These sheep, multiplying themselves to an enormous number, afterwards gave to the Islands their present name, i. e. Sheeps islands.

The history of the Norwegian settlements in the western Isles is but shortly and superficially told in our ancient Sagas. When it is said that they were colonized by emigrants, discontented with king Harold's strong rule, this is only partly true, for we learn from the Irish annals, that Vikings from the north showed themselves there and made depredations as far back as 793 [2]. Yet it is very probable, that the chief influx of emigrants came in the times of king Harold, especially in the first half of his long reign, when his conquests were newly made, and when, indeed, also the emigration to Iceland became frequent. All the Sagas which mention these events, agree in this point, that the discontented emigrants, who had assembled in the western Islands as well as in the Orkneys and Shetland, did at last feel themselves strong enough to take revenge, running over to Norway and ravaging its coasts, thereby compelling king Harold to make a great expedition personally to the western seas, in which he conquered Orkney, Shetland, the western Islands and even Man, thereby establishing for the first time the dominion of Norway in these parts, and leaving an hereditary claim upon them to his descendants. But they do not agree in the particulars. Some of them say, that Harold left the powerful Norwegian Ketil Flatnef (flat-beak) as his lieutenant there, but that afterwards Ketil threw off the allegiance [3]; others, that Ketil, having emigrated from Norway in disgust with the conquests of Harold, took his abode in the Sudreys whither soon the greatest part of his relations and friends had repaired, and where he died [4]. This is the more likely version of the two, and as the tale that Ketil really exercised some authority in the Islands, does

[1] Dicuilus, de mensura orbis terræ, ed. by Letronne, p. 38, 39.

[2] A. D. 793, it is related in the Ulster annals, that the pagans ravaged all the islands of Britain, in 794 (or according to other Chronicles in 795) they devastated Rachrin, in a. d. 801 (or according to others 797, 806) they burned the sacred buildings at Iona.

[3] Landnáma II, 15.

[4] Laxdæla Saga.

not appear to be unfounded in tradition, it is to be supposed, that he established his authority, or succeeded in gaining to himself a lordship there in opposition to king Harold, which supposition is strongly confirmed by the fact, that his daughter, the above mentioned Aude, was married to the celebrated *Olaf* the *white* (Amh-*labh*) the first Norwegian king of Dublin († c. 872). The circumstance, however, that nearly all those friends or relations of Ketil left these parts for Iceland, where even his own daughter Aude, after the fall of her son Thorstein the Red, finished with taking up her abode, shows that they could not resist the power of Harold, who, as it is expressly told, appointed an Earl as his lieutenant in the Isles, named *Tryggvi*, and, when Tryggvi was killed, another, named *Asbjörn*, with the surname of *Skerjablesi.* This Asbjörn, however, was likewise killed, by two relations of Ketil Flatnef, as shall be mentioned hereafter. Whether Asbjörn got a successor or not, is not mentioned; we are rather inclined to believe, that in the later times of king Harold's reign, when his sons made war among themselves, and still more after his death, the allegiance of the Sudreys became very slight, or was entirely thrown off; there is at least no mention to be found, that king Hácon the Good, the son of Harold, although a powerful and enterprizing monarch, did ever receive tribute or homage from these Islands. Or, if the dependency was enforced, this was rather done by the powerful Earls of Orkney, who, being nearer at hand, might easier do it, and indeed, as will be seen from our Notes to the Chronicle, for some time at least held the Islands or part of them as an *arriere fief*. For these subsequent events, we refer the Reader to our notes, here it was our intention only to show the foundation of the Norwegian power in these parts.

It may, however, convey a clear idea of the manner in which our unruly fore-fathers visited, dwelt in, and left these Islands during the unsettled times of the emigration, if we trace here in a few fragmentary lines the deeds and wanderings of the most prominent among those warriors who frequented them, as they are told in the Sagas, especially the Landnáma. These tales may also serve for a supplementary addition to our notes affixed, containing the beginning of the earlier history of the Norwegians in the Isles, while the latter contain the continuation.

We begin with the family of the above mentioned Ketil Flatnef.

That he had been in the Sudreys and enjoyed a great reputation long before the expedition of Harold (about 870), is clear from the circumstance, that the fall of Thorstein the red, the son of his daughter Aude and king Olaf the white, must, according to the best calculations, have taken place about a. d. 874, who as he left then several children, cannot have been born, (and consequently the marriage between his father and mother contracted) later than about 852, when Olaf conquered Dublin; at this time, therefore, Ketil Flatnef must already have visited those parts, if, indeed, Olaf did not marry his daughter in Norway. But even if it were so, we may at least conclude from such a fact that a close connexion existed for many years between Ketil and the powerful Norwegians in the West. Ketil was a son of the mighty baron Björn Buna, in the province of Sogn, in Norway, and had two brothers, named Hrapp and Helgi. He had two sons, Björn and Helgi Bjóla (a surname, adopted as it seems, in the west), and several daughters, of whom Auda called the deep-wealthy, the wife of King Olaf, has been already mentioned. Both of Ketil's sons settled finally in Iceland. Helgi went first, it seems directly from Norway, and occupied vast districts in the south-western part of the country. Björn sailed first to the Sudreys or Scotland, where his relations were already established, but finding, that they had all embraced Christianity, he felt so annoyed, that he followed the example of his brother, and took up his abode on the large peninsula protruding from the western coast of Iceland. His sister Aude, after the decease of her husband, king Olaf, followed her son, Thorstein the red, to Scotland, where, in company with Sigurd the first Earl of Orkney, he conquered Caithness, Sutherland, Ross and Moray, and continued to domineer for some time, until the Scotchmen rebelled, and killed him (about a. d. 874). Aude then went with his children and the whole band of his followers to Orkney, where she staid, as it appears, for a longer time, until the greater part, at least, of her grand-children were grown up. It has been already mentioned, that she married one of the daughters, Groa, to Duncan Earl of Caithness. From Orkney she proceeded to the Færeys, where likewise she married one of her grand-daughters, and from there to Iceland. Having suffered ship-wreck near the abode of her brother Helgi, she repaired to him, but as he invited her only with the half of her company, she left him disgusted with what

she called his meanness, and went to her other brother, Björn, who met her with his retinue, and invited her with her whole troop. This invitation she accepted joyfully; afterwards she took lands in possession herself of an immense extent, and set up her abode at Hvamm, near the Breidfjord, where Olaf Feilan, the only son of Thorstein, succeeded her at her death, on the very day he was married. She was a Christian, but did not build any church, erecting only some crosses at which she said her prayers, and before her death she expressed the wish to be buried on the part of the beach covered by the sea at flood time, not willing, she said, to rest in unhallowed soil. She, as well as her brothers, were ancestors of powerful and illustrious descendants [1].

In the valley of Hvin, in the south-west of Norway, lived a baron, named Grim, to whom a highborn man from Götaland, Björn, applied for reception, as he had been outlawed from his country. Grim received him in his house, but tempted by the immense mass of silver which Björn had carried with him, he planned a scheme to murder him; this, however, did not succeed, and Björn took up his abode with another baron, named Andott, who lived in the same district, and whose daughter he married, when his first wife, left by him in Götaland, was dead. Hither also his son of his first marriage, named Eyvind, repaired, and got all his ships of war, he himself being tired of piratical life, which he had carried on for some time during his exile. Eyvind, surnamed *Austmaðr* (the Man from the East), made sail to the western islands, but entered after the lapse of some time into a treaty with the Irish king Cerbhal (of Ossory 858—888), by which he promised to defend his lands, on condition of becoming his son-in-law. Accordingly, he married his daughter Rafarta, and had with her a son, named Helgi, who was sent to be bred up with some people in the Sudreys. Two years afterwards, however, when his father and mother went to see him, they found him so lean and starved, that they could hardly recognize him, upon which they took him to themselves. From this circumstance Helgi got the nickname of *magri* (the meagre, lean).

Meanwhile Thrond a son of Björn, Eyvind's father, with the sister of Andott, had grown up to be a warrior like his half-brother, and of course set out on piratical expeditions as soon as possible. He fought

[1] Landnáma II. 11. 15—19. Eyrbyggja Saga Ch. 1—3. Laxd. Saga Ch. 1—7.

in the great battle of Hafrsfjord (872), where king Harold crushed the power of the petty kings in south-western Norway, on the side of the latter, and was obliged, like so many others of the vanquished, to take to flight. He sailed to the Sudreys, accompanied by a renowned Viking from Rogaland (near Stavanger), Anund, who had fought at his side, and lost a leg in the battle, but nevertheless, when his wound was healed, continuing a staunch warrior on his wooden leg, from which he got the nickname of *tréfót* (wood-foot). When he was fighting his hardest, it is related that his men used to shove a block of wood to him; resting his maimed leg upon this, he laid about him manfully. Thrond and Anund became intimate friends, and passed some years in piratical expeditions, chiefly on the Scottish coasts. One summer they went to Ireland, and spent some months in company with the aforesaid Eyvind, who generously made over to his halfbrother Thrond all his part of the inheritance which might become due to him at the decease of their father Björn. At the end of the summer Thrond and Anund returned to the Sudreys. Some years afterwards Thrond received the news from Norway of his father's death, and that the inheritance had been taken possession of in his name by his uncle Andott, but that the traitor Grim, now lieutenant to the king, claimed it in the name of the latter. Thrond therefore, although now an outlaw in Norway, lost no time in returning thither, accompanied by his faithful friend Anund, and sailed from the Sudreys in so little time, that afterwards he got the surname of *mjöksiglandi* (the fast-sailing). They were well received by Andott, who very willingly paid out the inheritance, glad, he said, to see it in the hands of his relation, and not in those of the royal servants, but advised them earnestly to go away as soon as possible, in order to avoid the persecutions of Grim. Thrond listened to the advice, and hurried away, with the intention of going to Iceland, which he also carried out, settling on the east coast. Anund, however, remained, saying that he would see his friends and relations in Rogaland. Thither accordingly he went, and passed a part of the winter there, living secretly at different places, and killing the man appointed by the king to superintend the estate which had formerly belonged to himself. Hearing, however, that Grim had killed his kind host, Andott, because he had yielded up the inheritance to his nephew Thrond, he hastened back to Agder, sought and found

the young sons of Andott, who had been obliged to abscond, and assisted them not only in killing Grim by setting fire to his house, but also in extorting from the royal Earl in these parts large treasures as wérgyld for their father. Afterwards, Anund in company with one of the brothers went to Iceland, and both of them settled in the north of Iceland. The other brother, who had more difficulty in escaping from the persecution of the Earl's followers, came afterwards to Iceland, and took up his abode near his brother [1].

Meanwhile, the son of Eyvind and his Irish princess, Helgi magri, had become a mighty chieftain, and married a daughter of Ketil Flatnef, sister to the aforesaid Queen Auda. This circumstance appears to prove, what is also the most likely in itself, that he had passed the most of his time in the west, and was an inmate, either of Ireland or of the Sudreys; but that he was also no stranger to Norway, we see from the circumstance, that he had a son settled, and therefore likely born, there. Like his other relations, Helgi migrated with sons and retinue to Iceland, about A. D. 880, where he chose his lands on the north side, in the inner part of the Eyjafjord, and became one of the most powerful Lords. The particulars about his arrival and taking possession of his territories are rather curious. He was, it is told, brought up in Christianity (which is also likely from his having an Irish mother), and believed in Christ, but was nevertheless much „mixed in his faith," using to invoke the aid of Thor, the pagan god, on expeditions at sea and wherever strength and hardihood was needed. When descrying the snowclad peaks of Iceland far in the horizon, he applied to Thor for an oracular decision about what part of the coast he should land at, and the answer directed him to the Eyjafjord on the north side. Before detecting the opening leading to it, his son Rolf (that aforesaid son, previously settled in Norway) asked, whether it was the intention of Thor to assign the glacial ocean for their winter residence. Soon, however, they found the gap, and Helgi now occupied as his territory the whole district around the long and broad fjord, from the outermost promontories to the innermost recess, calling it Eyjafjord from its islands. He erected his own abode on a place which, being a Christian, he called Christnes, and that name continued, although his sons and descendants

[1] Landnáma III. 13—15. Grettis Saga.

for three or four generations were pagans. Then he distributed lands to his followers, and afterwards to other new-comers, among whom were the aforesaid sons of Andott, the brother-in-law of his father, who no doubt resorted to him on account of this relationship [1].

It is mentioned above, that Ketil Flatnef had a brother, called Hrapp. That he also had emigrated to the Sudreys, at least for some time, is to be concluded from the circumstance, that his son, Ørlyg, was educated as a Christian by „the holy bishop Patrick" in the Sudreys. When grown up, he resolved to go to Iceland and asked the advice and aid of the bishop. Patrick gave him timber to build a church, a *plenarium*, a bell, a gold coin, and some consecrated earth to put beneath the corner pillars, as no other dedication could be effected; he directed him to consecrate it to St. Columba, and to choose his abode only there, where he saw from without three mountains separated by fjords, and a valley in each of them; he should sail to the southernmost, and build the church, where on an open space he should find three erect stones. Ørlyg sailed, but in approaching Iceland a storm drove him to the north west; he called on the aid of his saint foster-father, promising to give his name to the place where he landed. He came safely to a fiord on the large peninsula, which stretches out to N. W., and called it Patricksfiord, which name it bears still. This place, however, did not answer to the aforesaid description; next year, therefore, he sailed southwards and found the right spot in the territory of his cousin Helgi Bjola, the son of Ketil Flatnef mentioned above. Helgi gave him lands there, around the mountain in question, which was called Esjuberg, and here Ørlyg built his church and dwelling house. The bell which had fallen over board when he sailed in, was afterwards found on the shore, covered with sea-weeds. His descendants became great and powerful Lords, and continued Christians although they were not baptized; they believed, it is said, in St. Columba [2].

Among the daughters of Ketil Flatnef, one had a son, called Ketil after his grandfather; he was brought up as a christian, and, migrating, like his relatives, from the Sudreys to Iceland, took his territory on the south-eastern side, at the foot of the immense glaciers of Skaftá and Sída. There was an old tradition, that Papes, i. e. chris-

[1] Landnáma III. 12. sq.

[2] Landnáma I. 12.

tian ecclesiastics from Ireland, had formerly resided here. It seems to be beyond doubt, that at several places on the south-eastern side the first Norwegian settlers found traces of these ecclesiastics, such as bells, croziers, Irish books, etc.; and that after them two of these places got their names, the island of Papey and the small district called Papyli. It is greatly confirmed by the indisputable authority of Dicuil [1], who says, that some Irish clergymen told him, that about a. d. 795 they had passed the time from February to August on an island which they believed to be Thule, where the sun at the summer solstice was but a short time below the horizon, and that it was only a day's sail from the frozen sea. This description can hardly mean any country but Iceland, and coincides exactly with the unpretending and simple narrative of the Icelandic recorders. The Irish priests and monks, or the Papes, as they called them, they had sufficiently learnt to know in Ireland and the Sudreys, as well as in Orkney and Shetland, where islands, called Papey, and districts called Papyli, bear sufficient witness of their existence. According to the oldest Icelandic writer, Ari fróði [2], the Papes even continued to reside in Iceland till the arrival of the Norwegians, and left it only because they would not live together with pagans. Maybe some of these hermit settlements (for otherwise they cannot be considered) continued in remote or sheltered places down to that time, while generally as that mentioned by Dicuil, they had been abandoned already soon after they had been formed. It is very likely that Ketil really found such an establishment still existing. The tradition was, that pagans could not inhabit the district, but that Ketil, being christian, found no difficulty, and fixed his residence on the place called *Kirkjubør* (church-town). This name, however, seems to involve, that he found already a church there, and maybe also the ecclesiastics, who hitherto might have found means to prevent the pagans from molesting them. According to another tradition, Ketil built a church himself. He got the nickname „*fíflski*“ (the foolish) perhaps from the Pagans, who regarded his christian zeal as a kind of foolishness [3].

The mother of Ketil Flatnef was sister to a great Lord, named Ve-

[1] Dicuilus, l. c. p. 38.

[2] Islendingabók Ch. I.

[3] Landnáma IV. 11.

mund gamli (the old), who likewise lived in the province of Sogn in Norway. The son of Vemund, Vedorm, the cousin of Ketil, had a son, called Holmfast, and a nephew, called Grim, who made an expedition together to the Sudreys, probably with the intention to aid or revenge their relatives, and killed the above mentioned Earl, Asbjörn, carrying away his wife and daughter as captives. This was, perhaps, the cause why his father Vedorm durst not stay any longer in Norway, but fled to the then almost uninhabited district of Jamtaland, east of Throndheim. The captive damsel, called Arneida, continued to live in his family as a slave. Once he was visited by a Norwegian from Verdal in Throndheim, called Ketil, who had already settled in Iceland, but now made a short trip back to his native country. He bought Arneida from Vedorm, adding a third to the price which the latter demanded, thereby showing how strong a liking he had taken to her. Before leaving Norway with him, she was lucky enough to find a chest filled with silver coins, which had been hidden in the earth; she showed it to Ketil, who in his gratefulness offered her the choice, whether she would follow him as his wife, or be restored by him to her relations. She chose to marry him, and when he had returned to Iceland he honoured her by calling his dwelling place Arneiðarstaðir [1].

One of the most powerful chieftains and naval warriors in Norway in the earlier times of king Harold was *Geirmund Heljarskinn*, descended from the renowned king Half in Hordaland, and enjoying himself the title of king. The Sudreys and Ireland were also the favourite haunt of his expeditions, and he was generally regarded as the principal of all the Vikings residing there. He was privy to the coalition of the petty kings which ended so unluckily for themselves in the battle of Hafrsfiord (872), but happening to be in the West when the battle was fought, he did not take part in it. The aforesaid Thrond mjöksiglandi and his friend Anund Trefót exhorted him to return to Norway with them, and try to win back his family estates, which had been sequestered by Harold; but being prudent enough to understand that he could not cope with the latter, he resisted their exhortations, and preferred settling in Iceland, whither, accordingly, he set sail, in company with his third cousin Ulf, who was married to a sister of Helgi magri, and another

[1] Landnáma IV. 2. 12.

powerful Viking, Steinulf, whose sister afterwards married the son of Ulf. They settled in the north-west part of the island, where Geirmund occupied vast territories, and, although dropping his royal title, lived in a style more than kingly. Relatives of him and of his partners afterwards settled in his neighbourhood, and he found himself soon the head of a very powerful clan, which continued so even for some generations[1]. Another of the temporary Sudreyan settlers, Sæmund from Sogn, was in the neighbourhood of Hafrsfjord, when the battle was fought. His ally and sworn brother Ingemund from Raumsdal, who was with him, resolved to fight on king Harold's side; Sæmund, however, declined, and thereby exasperated the king so much, that he deemed it safest to settle in Iceland, where he chose his territory on the north side. He was afterward followed by his friend[2].

We have already pointed above to the fact, that in the western islands the original population was never entirely absorbed by the Norwegian settlers as in Orkney and perhaps in Shetland. This may, we own it, for a great part be ascribed to the circumstance that the newcomers from Norway found a more dense population there than in the latter, if, indeed, Shetland had any inhabitants before the Norwegians; yet still, and chiefly, it must be accounted for by the aforesaid circumstance, that they were more used as a kind of stepping-stone to other settlements, or as temporary strongholds, than as places for lasting settlements themselves, and that their Norwegian population, consequently, was generally of a more transient and fluctuating character. In saying this, however, we do not mean to deny, that real and lasting Norwegian settlements were made in many parts of the western Islands, and that the predominant influence was on the side of the Norwegians, but only to assert, that the Gaelic population was by far the largest, and that the chief language spoken there was always the Gaelic, although of course the Norse must have come to be pretty well understood by most of the inhabitants. The greater part of the Islands have Gaelic names, but some of them, even of the larger, have Norwegian ones,

[1] Landnáma II. 19. sq.

[2] Landn. III. 6. Vatnsdœla S.

(that is to say, their original form, still shining through the alteration of later days, is Norwegian), and no Gaelic besides [1]. To begin from the North: Lewis is only an alteration of the Norwegian *Ljóðhús* (the sounding house), wherefore also the island is called *Leodus* in our chronicle. Northuist, Harris and Southuist, was called *Ívist*, which means simply „dwelling", „inhabitation", intimating, perhaps, that this was the chief abode of the Norwegians in that quarter of the group. The names *Fladda*, *Sanda*, *Watersa*, *Eriska*, are no doubt originally *Flatey* (flat isle), *Sandey*, *Vatnsey*, *Eiriksey; Raasa* and *Rona* were called *Rauneyjar*, the latter consequently *Rauney* (from *raun*, experiment); *Sky* was called *Skíð* (piece of board), *Ulva,* near Mull, seems to have been *Ulfey* (wolf's-isle), *Gometra Gudmundarey* (Gudmund's Island), *Staffa Stafey* (the island of staves, because of the basaltic pillars), *Jura*, *Diura*, perhaps *Dýrey* (island of deer). Now it must be owned, that our ancestors, like most people in former times, often changed names, belonging to other languages, into forms as similar as possible in their own language, giving a kind of plausible signification (as, indeed, when the Greeks made *Hierosolyma* of *Jerusalem*), and that therefore „Ljóðhús", „Ívist", „Skíð" etc. may only be substitutes for Gaelic names of a similar sound, but quite different signification; yet this does not alter the fact, that the mentioned islands had got names and therefore were probably inhabited by Norwegians; nor is it to be denied, that at least the final syllable *a* or *ay* in so many of the names, even in those, the chief part of which are of Gaelic origin, is the Norwegian *ey* (island), as, besides the aforesaid ones, which are thoroughly Norwegian, *Pabba* (*Papey*), *Oronsa* (*Oransey*), *Colonsa* (*Kólnsey*) etc. — Even the name *calve* (*kálfr*, calf, always affixed to the name of a larger adjacent island, of which that in question is said to be a „calf") is found here in „*Mýlarkálfr*" — the

[1] It will easily be understood that not all of the Islands are mentioned in our Sagas, and as there exists no separate list of them, the number of those names known in their Norwegian form, is rather small. Here they are: *Ljóðhús* (Lewis), *Ívist* (Uist), *Skíð* (Sky), *Rauneyjar* (Rona and Raasa), *Mýl* (Mull), *Mýlarkálfr* (Calf of Mull), *Eyin helga* (the holy Island i. e. Iona), *Tyrvist* (Tyree), *Koln* (Colonsay), *Kjarbarey* (Kerrera), *Il* (Isla), *Guðey* (Gigha), *Sandey* (Sanda), *Hersey* (Arran), *Bót* (Bute), *Melasey* (Lamlash), *Kumreyjar* (Cumrays).

Calve of Mull, near Tobermory. Also some Norwegian names of single places are yet existing, and there might on more accurate examination be found to be more than expected, as „*Cornbust*“, „*Kirkbust*“ in Benbecula, originally *Kornbólstaðr* or *Kornbústaðr*, *Kirkjubústaðr* (Corn abode, church abode), of which names a great quantity exists in Norway, generally abridged in quite the same manner. In Man likewise, although the language is a dialect of the Gaelic, and the greater part of the population therefore always must have been of Celtic origin, many of the local names are Norwegian, as *Snæfell* (Snow-mountain), the name of the highest peak, *Dalby* (*Dalabœr*), *Fleshwich* (*Fleskvík*), *Wardfell* (*Varðfell*), *Perwick* (*Petrsvík*), *Strandhall* (*Strandarhöll*); *Ronaldsway* (*Ragnvaldsvað*), *Langnes* (*Langanes*), *Laxi* (*Laxá*), *Egness* (*Eggjanes*), *Kennay* (*Kinná*), *Sulby* (*Súlabœr*), *Mælar*, *Ayre* (*Eyri*), *Jurby* (*Jórabýr*, *Dýrabýr?*), *Mirescog* (*Mýraskógr*), *Ramsay* (*Hrafnsá*), etc. — several places having even double names, or rather having had them in former times, as when from the record of limits, written in the same codex with the chronicle, we learn that *Kirk-Michael* was also called *villa Thorkel*, i. e. *Þorkelsbœr* [1]. The best evidence however of the Norwegian population having been tolerably strong at Man, are the numerous runic inscriptions in the Norse language still preserved, but even these show by their numerous grammatical errors, that the language spoken here had lost much of its purity, no doubt owing to the strong mixture of the Norwegians with Celtic elements; and, indeed, of the names occurring in the inscriptions themselves perhaps the one half are Gaelic [2]. These circumstances, here explained,

[1] In this record, although the names seem to be very badly written, we find more Norwegian forms, as *Trollotophtan* (*Trollatúptir*), *Oxwath* (*Uxavað*), *Aryeus-ryn* (*Árósrein*), *Staynarhaa* (*Steinarhaugr*), *Mourou* (*Maurá*), *Rosfial* (*Hrossfjall*), *Cornama* (*Kornhamarr*), *Totmanby* (Þofta ......), *Oxreiseherad* (*Uxreisaherað*), *Corna* (*Korná*), *Heringstad* (*Hæringstaðir*), *Gryseth* (*Grjótsetr*), *Duppolla* (*Djúppollr*).

[2] Although I have already given an account and explanation of these inscriptions in the „Mémoires“ of the Royal Society for the ancient literature of the North, yet, having since that time through the kind communications of Mssrs G. Cumming of Lichfield and J. Worsaae of Copenhagen, been furnished with more accurate and correct copies of some of them, as well as with copies of others not known, or at least not transcribed when I wrote that paper, I do not think it superfluous or at least not uninteresting

account amply for the lesser tenacity of the Norwegian language, manners and institutions in the Isle of Man and the western Islands, than

to the Reader, to subjoin here a short list of them, referring to the lithographic table here inserted.

The inscriptions may be divided in two classes, according to the form of the letters, as shown in the table; the two belonging to class A being quite distinct from those belonging to class B, engraved evidently by another man, and perhaps even at a different period.

Class. A. 1. Cross at Kirk Michael: MAL LUMCUN RAISTI CRVS ÞANA EFTER MAL MVRV FVSTRA SINA TOTER TVFCALS OS AÞISL ATI.

In the normal orthography: Mal Lumkun reisti kross þenna eftir Malmuru fóstra sína dóttir Dufgals es (er) Aðisl átti. Here, however, are several glaring grammatical errors; if *sína*, as it must be, is added, as adjective, to *fóstra*, which is masculine, and means foster-father, educator, it ought to be *sinn*, not *sína*, which is the feminine form; and again, if the feminine is right, and *fóstra* means fostermother, it ought to be „*fóstru.*" Further, if „*dóttir*" is apposition to *sína*, as it seems to be, it ought to be the accusative, *dóttur*, not the nominative, *dóttir.* Else, if the nominative be right, it must be the apposition to the subject, Mal Lumkun, and this be the name of a female, which, however, does not seem probable. Supposing then, what seems the most probable, that Malmuru is the name of a female person, the fostermother of Mallumkun, the whole ought to sound thus in the normal orthography: „Mal Lumkun reisti kross þenna eftir Malmuru fóstru sína, dóttur Dufgals, er Aðisl átti. In Latin: *Mallumkun erexit crucem hanc post Malmuram educatricem suam, filiam Dugaldi, quam Adislus habuit* (i. e. *in matrimonio*).

„Os" we suppose is badly written instead of „es", and the last letter of the name AÞISL, which is now only a single vertical line, to have lost the small addition, which makes it an L. Aðisl or Aðils is a well known northern name.

A. 2. Fragment of Cross at Kirk Onchan: . . . ITRA ES LAIFA FVSTRA CVÞAN SVN ILAN. The last four words are evidently, transposed into normal orthography: „*fóstra góðan, sun illan*" i. e. „*educatorem bonum, filium malum*"; curious words, showing, that these inscriptions were not only panegyrics. Whether, however, both epitheta refer to one person or to two, is impossible to say, as we do not have the whole. *Leifa*, accus. form of „*Leifi*", seems to be the name of the person or one of the persons in question. Of „itra es" nothing satisfactory can be made out.

Class. B. 3. Cross at Ballaugh: ÞORLIBR ÞIVTVLB SVNR RAIST CRVS ÞaNA AIFTIR VB SVN SIN. In normal orthography: Þorleifr Þjóðúlfs (Þjóstúlfs) sunr reisti kross þenna eftir Ubba (Úlf?) sun sinn."

in those north of Scotland, which were entirely norwegianized, and it is rather to be wondered at, that the connexion with and dependence

Even here we light upon many inaccuracies or errors. In ÞIVTVLB the final S, indicating the genitive, is wanting, because the following word begins with an S, and the name itself ought to be spelled either ÞIVÞVLB, if it means *Þjóðúlfs*, or ÞIVSTVLB, if it means *Þjóstúlfs*, the latter case being, perhaps, the right one, as in No. 15 we find likewise T written instead of ST (RAITI inst. of RAISTI). In RAIST the final I is wanting, *raist* or *reist* being the preterite tense of *rísta* (to engrave), not of *reisa* (to raise). If VB means *Ubba*, accus. of *Ubbi*, it ought to have been written VBA, if *Úlf*, acc. of *Úlfr*, likewise a common name, the L is wanting, if, indeed, the writer may not be supposed to have pronounced the word like the inhabitants of the Setersdal in Norway, who say *Úv* for *Úlf*, *Káv* for *Kálf* etc.

In Latin: *Thorleifus Thjodulfi (Thiostulfi) filius erexit crucem hanc post Ubbonem (Ulfum) filium suum.*

4. Cross at Kirk Braddan: VTR RISTI CRVS ÞaNa AFT FRaCA FAÞVR SIN IN ÞVRBIAVRN . . . in normal orthography: Óttarr reisti kross þenna eft Frakka föður sinn, en Þorbjörn . . . . ; VTR ought to have been written VTAR, if, inded, the name has not been GAVTR, as in the following, with the two first letters destroyed; RISTI is wrong, instead of RAISTI. In Latin: *Ottarus (Gautus) erexit crucem hanc post Franconem patrem suum, sed Thorbjornus . . . .*

5. Cross at Kirk Michael: MAIL BRICTI SVNR AÞACANS SMIÞ RAISTI CRVS ÞANA FVR SALV SINA SIN BRVCVIN CAVT CIRÞI ÞANa AVC ALA IMAVN. In norm. orth.: „Mælbrigði sunr Aðakans smiðar reisti kross þenna fyrir sálu sinni (syndugri), Gautr gerði þenna ok alla i Mön." MAILBRICTI ought to have been spelled MAILBRICÞI; SMIÞ is a fault, instead of genit. SMIÞAR; SINA, accusative, is wrong instead of SINI, dative; of SIN BRVCVIN we cannot make out anything if it be not a complete miswriting of SINTVCRI or SVNTVCRI (syndugri); CAVT ought to be CAVTR, with the nominative R finale. In Latin: *Mælbrigidus filius Athacani fabri erexit crucem hanc pro anima sua (peccatrice); Gautus fecit hanc (sc. crucem) et omnes in Mannia.*

6. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . . . ÞANA AF VFAIC FAVÞVR SIN IN CAVTR CIRÞI SVNR BIARNAR CVBCVLI. In norm. orth.: . . . . Þenna eft Úfeig föður sinn, en Gautr gerði, sunr Bjarnar : . . . . In AF the final T is wanting; CVB CVLI I cannot explain, maybe it is misspelled, or a Gaelic name. In Latin: . . . . . *hanc (sc. crucem) post Ufeigum patrem suum, sed Gautus fecit, filius Björnonis* . . . Úfeigr is a very common Norwegian name.

7 and 8. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . CRVS ÞAN AFTIR . . . .

on Norway could be kept up so long, as till a. d. 1266, and in ecclesiastical respects for more than a century longer. It was owing, as it

CRIMS INS SVARTA; in norm. orthogr.: . . . Kross þenna eftir . . . . Gríms ins svarta . . . (in ÞAN the final A is omitted because the next word begins with an A); in Latin: *Crucem hanc post . . . . . Grimi nigri.*

9. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . . . SVAC RAISTI CRVS ÞAN EFT RVMVN . . . . . . NT; in norm. orth.: . . . Svangr reisti kross þenna eft Hrómund . . . . . . da (góðan bónda?). SVAC wants the final R, because the next word begins with an R; perhaps the first letters of this name are destroyed, though *Svangr* may very well be used as a name without any addition. ÞAN here likewise instead of ÞANA. In Latin: . . . *Svangus erexit crucem hanc post Romundum . . .*

10.[11] Cross at Kirk Michael: IVALFIR SVNR ÞVRVLFS EINS RAVÞA RISTI CRVS ÞANA AFT FRIÞV MVÞVR SINa. In norm. orth.: Jóálfr sunr Þórólfs ins rauða reisti kross þenna eft Friðu móður sína. IVALFIR inst. of IVALFR, EINS inst. of INS, RISTI inst. of RAISTI. In Latin: *Joalfus filius Thorulfi rufi erexit crucem hanc post Fridam matrem suam.* At the foot of this cross, the inscription No. 11 is faintly scratched, too faintly to be possibly made anything out of.

12. Cross at Kirk Braddan: . . . . . R aSCITIL VILTI I TRICV AIÞSOARA SIIN — in norm. orth.: . . . . (e)r Ásketill vélti í tryggvu, eiðsvara sinn; aSCITIL inst. of ASCATIL, AIÞSOARA inst. of AIÞSVARA . . in Latin — *quem Ascatillus decepit in treuga, consacramentalem suum.*

13. Cross at Kirk Andreas: SaNTVLF EIN SVARTI RAISTI CRVS þaNA AFTIR ARIN BIAVRC CVINV SINA — in norm. orth.: Sandúlfr (Söndulfr) inn svarti reisti kross þenna eftir Arinbjörg konu sína — VLF inst. of VLFR, EIN inst. of IN; in Latin: *Sandulfus niger erexit crucem hanc post Arinbjargam uxorem suam.*

14. Cross at Tynwald hill: . . . INaIRVIR RAIST RVNAR ÞAER AFTIR . . . . In norm. orth.: . . . inervir (?) reist rúnar þær eftir . . . in Latin . . . (ineirvir?) sculpsit literas hasce post . . . . The name INaIRVIR, evidently not complete, is perhaps a Gaelic one; to the Norse language it hardly belongs.

15. Cross at the Vicarage of Jurby: . . . . . RV SVN IN aNAN RAITI FAIRÞVR IAL . . . . . In norm. orthogr.: . . . ru sun, en annan reisti Færþórr (?) Jal . . . . . , RAITI is misspelled for RAISTI; FAIRÞVR is rather curious; I have ventured to suggest the form Færþórr, which may be called grammatically possible, but never occurs anywhere in books or monuments. Perhaps the name is a Gaelic one, as Ferteth, Ferchad, only altered or misspelled. In Latin: . . . . *ræ filium, sed aliam (crucem) erexit Fairthurus Jal . . .*

appears to us, partly to the naval strength of Norway in the middle ages, partly, and perhaps chiefly, to the spirit of independence, prevailing among the insular chieftains themselves, which made them prefer an allegiance, which owing to the distance could scarcely be more than nominal, to the Norwegian kings, rather than to the dominion of the Scotish king, who being always at hand, could exercise it with greater force. It is very likely, that in this respect the expedition of king Hácon, had it even been crowned with complete success, would have soon had quite different effects from what might be expected, as the chieftains, seeing that now also the Norwegian king had the mind and power to make their dependency a real, not a nominal one, they would lose their interest in keeping it up against their national sympathies, and therefore sooner or later would have thrown it off. Much has been said against king Magnus, because he concluded the treaty of Perth, and ceded the Islands to Scotland. To us, however, it appears on the contrary, a sign of great political prudence in the young king, to perceive, as he evidently did, the impossibility of main-

16. Cross at Kirk Braddan: ÞVRLABR NEACI RISTI CRVS ÞaNA AFT FIAC SVN IN BRVÞVR SVN IABRS. In norm. orth.: Þorleifr (Þorláfr) Neaki reisti kross þenna eft Fjak (Fjang'?) sun (sinn) en bróðursun Jabrs (Ívars?). The names NEACI and FIAC seem to be Gaelic; RISTI is misspelled for RAISTI; after SVN the pron. poss. SIN seems to be wanting. IABRS is either Gaelic, or misspelled for IBARS, IVARS. In Latin: *Thorlavus Neaki erexit crucem hanc post Fiac filium (suum) sed fratris filium Jabri.*

17. Cross at Kirk Onchan - *a)* on the top: .. CRVS .., i. e. kross — *crucem.* *b)* lower down. .: . . ISVCRIST, i. e. Jesu Krist. *c)* below on the right arm: ÞVRIÞ RAIST RVNAR; Þúríðr reist rúnar, i. e. *Thurida sculpsit literas.* On the other side, *d)* below on the right arm: . . . SVNR RAISTI AFTIR SVN SINA MVRCIBLV; here it seems likely that the B in MVRCIBLU is turned by a mistake to the wrong side, and ought to have been an a; MVRCIaLV would be Myrgjalu, Myrgjǫlu, accus. of a not uncommon feminine Gaelic name, written in ancient records sometimes *Muriella.* SINA (lat. *suam*) however, and the feminine name Muriella cannot agree with SVN; I might therefore be inclined to think, that SVN is totally misspelled by a careless or ignorant engraver, and ought to be CVNV; the whole would then run thus: . . . . sunr reisti (kross) eftir konu sína Myrgjǫlu — . . . *filius erexit (crucem) post uxorem suam Muriellam.* *e)* Below, on the left arm: VCICAT ASVIR AÞICRIT AM . . . . NÞ — This seems to us wholly unintelligible, and is, perhaps, Gaelic.

taining a dominion of this precarious character, and to prefer ceding it on honorable conditions while his power was still strong enough to obtain such, than to struggle on at the risk of losing it unconditionally. It must nevertheless be owned that the connexion, however loose it may have been and the anomaly of it ever so evident to all and everybody, yet the comparatively short period, during which the connexion existed, cannot but be to us Norwegians one of peculiar interest and gratification to dwell on, as bearing ample evidence of the conspicuous position among the European powers enjoyed by Norway in its days of past glory. And very remarkable is the fact, that although so early severed from Norway, and with a population more Gaelic than Norwegian, the Isle of Man has preserved until our days the outward form at least of the legislature, peculiar to Norway in former times, and organized by the Norwegians wherever they formed settlements. Even the name of the place, where the annual meeting is held, the *Tynwald*, is the old Norwegian denomination of *Þingvöllr* (field of the Thing or Parliament), only slightly modified. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, that a Norwegian historiographer should look upon the ancient records contained in this small volume as of the greatest interest, and by re-publishing it in a handy form try to make it more accessible, than it has hitherto been, as well as by accompanying it with notes make it more intelligible and useful to his countrymen.

Of our Chronicle only one manuscript codex now exists, nor is it likely that there have at any time been other copies, at least none complete. The Codex, given, as we are informed by a notice written inside by „*Roger Dodsworth, Eboracensis, antiquitatum apprime studiosus*“ to the library of Sir Robert Cotton a. d. 1620, has since that time belonged to this collection also after the transferring of the whole library to the British Museum. The codex is signed *Julius*, A. VII, and in Wanley's Catalogue of the Cottonian Library it is „*Codex memdranaceus in quarto, constans e foliis 132.*“ The size, however, might rather be called duodecimo, than quarto. Nor is the volume entirely filled up with the Chronicle, on the contrary, this forms only a small part of the whole, for the contents of which (being 18 distinct pieces, most of them having originally nothing to do with each other, and only accidentally bound together,) we refer our readers to the Cata-

logue itself. Among these pieces, our Chronicle is number 3, and the following number 4, „*Limites seu divisiones terrarum monachorum de Russyn insulæ Manniæ a terris regis*", belongs to the same original volume, having been the last part of it before it was bound together with the other things. The hand-writing in the main part of the Chronicle bears the character common to the latter half of the thirteenth century, and as it finishes with the year 1257, where it is relieved by another, we may safely conclude, that the volume has been commenced some time previous to that period, and that the words, with which the legend, related p. 24 and 25 concludes: „*Hæc sicut ab ore ejus didicimus, scripsimus*", are the words of the author himself, not copied by him from another record, and consequently, that the author heard the tale from the very man, who was so wonderfully rescued from the persecution of Harold the son of Godred, about a. d. 1249 or 1250. With the entry for a. d. 1275, a third, more recent, hand-writing with cursive characters, like those usual about a. d. 1300, begins, and finally a fourth, with the entry for a. d. 1313. This shows, that the Chronicle has been successively continued from a. d. 1257 by contemporary writers, yet, as will easily be perceived, very languidly, without any pretensions to completeness, only some stray events being entered. The list of the bishops of Man, which follows the Chronicle as a kind of appendix, is begun by the same hand as that which has written the main part of the former, and carried down to about the same period, finishing with bishop Simon, who died a. d. 1247, but mentioning the sexennial vacancy of the see, which shows, that the writer has laid down his pen during the episcopate of Richard (from a. d. 1253), yet before his death (1274), as the entry about this bishop is written by another hand. This entry, as that about his successor Marcus, are in one hand-writing, consequently posterior to the death of Marcus, about 1300, but anterior to the death of his successor Alan, a. d. 1320, where a new hand commences, which lasts till a. d. 1348, when again another hand-writing, of a more recent character, begins, and lasts to the end, a. d. 1376. The last words have been obliterated. As to the author or compilator himself, it may be safely stated, that he was a monk of Russin abbey. Not only chronicles like these are generally the works of monks, or rather the annals of one or another monastery, successively continued by their inmates;

but several entries in our Chronicle are obviously such as to evince a peculiar interest in all and every thing concerning the aforesaid abbey. Thus, ad a. d. 1112, the foundation of the abbey of Savigny, the mother of Furness, is recorded; ad a. d. 1126, the foundation of Furness abbey, the mother of Russin; ad a. d. 1134, the foundation of Russin itsëlf; ad a. d. 1176, the foundation of the short-lived monastery of *Mýraskógr* and its translation to Russin; ad a. d. 1189, the death of Rodulf abbot of Furness; ad a. d. 1192, the migration of the abbey to, and re-migration from, Douglas; ad a. d. 1229, 1237, 1240, 1249 and 1265, the burial of illustrious persons at Russin; ad a. d. 1257, the dedication of the church at Russin; ad a. d. 1316 the spoliation of Russin abbey; and above all the statement about the miraculous event already mentioned, that the man who had fled from the persecutions of Harold (a. d. 1249 or 1250) came to Russin, and that the writer had taken the narrative down from his own mouth. Moreover, the records about the boundaries of the land belonging to the monastery, show that the book was in its possession at least at the time when this appendix was written. As to the manner in which it was originally got up, it is easy to see from a comparison with the Melrose Chronicle, that this has furnished, what we might style the frame - work to it, being the source, from which, although not immediately, the principal author compiled the statements of general interest, among which he inserted those stray original records which he had in store about the events in the isle of Man, the only way in which he was able to give to his work the character of annals, which had otherwise been impossible. The objection might be made, that, as many of the first entries are evidently in the words of Simeon of Durham, the author may have had immediate recourse to a copy of this author; it is, however, to be observed, that also in the Melrose Chronicle Simeon is verbally transcribed in many places, as far as his annals go; that no passage in our Chronicle originally due to Simeon, is wanting in the Melrose annals, which shows, that at least the author did not need any copy of Simeon to get any of his entries, and finally, that the borrowings from the Melrose Chronicle continue even after the period, when the annals of Simeon cease. The most characteristic of these we have pointed out in the notes, and among them, we will here only mention some containing the most con-

vincing proofs of our statements, viz. the entries about the foundation of Melrose abbey and those connected with it, that of Rievaux, its mother, and that of Holm Cultran, its daughter (p. 7. 8). Again, however, that the Melrose Chronicle cannot have been the immediate source of the present work, is evident from the great number of chronological errors, occurring in the latter and being as many divergencies from the most accurate statements in the former. Even the very entry about the foundation of Melrose abbey is wrongly referred to a. d. 1139, instead of 1136. We are therefore entitled to conclude, that our writer, in laying the plan or frame-work of his chronicle, has used a transcript only, derived through many intermediate copies from the original book of annals at Melrose. That this book was indeed sometimes lent out to other monasteries, no doubt for the purpose of being copied, or rather used as means to form the base upon which the peculiar annals of these monasteries were again to be constructed, appears from the two memoranda inserted in it, and reproduced in the preface to the Bannatyne edition (p. VI), stating that the abbot of Dundrenan borrowed it twice. The new Manuscript drawn up at Dundrenan or any other abbey might likewise be lent out in its turn to other monasteries, and in this way a series of transcripts or transcripts of transcripts might be traced, gradually deviating from the mother codex, until at last errors like those occurring in our Chronicle were engendered. As, in our Chronicle, the foundation of the abbey of Caldra is mentioned, although not spoken of in the Melrose Chronicle, it is not improbable that the copy drawn up in that abbey has been the nearer original of the former. On the other hand, when comparing our Chronicle with that of Lanercost, written at a much later period, we find so many instances of identity (all of them pointed out in our notes) that there can be no doubt about a connexion between both, while, again, the frequent divergencies and glaring errors of the latter puts it entirely out of question, that the Lanercost compiler can possibly have had immediate recourse to the *Chronicon regum Manniæ*. Indeed, if the annals of all those abbeys which existed on the Scoto-English borders, or in the western part of the metropolitan province of York, were still preserved, it might be found on closer examination, that they were all of them more or less immediately derived from the Chronicle of Melrose.

An abridged edition of our Chronicle has been already published by Camden, in his *Britannia* (London 1587 8vo) and only in this abridged form is was known by the public for a very long time. That Camden omitted the first part, previous to a. d. 1047 (or rather 1066), which contains only repetitions from Simeon of Durham, was no great harm, but it is difficult to guess, what might have induced him to omit other passages of great importance, as f. inst. that concerning the contested election of bishop Lawrence in 1248. The publication by Camden was afterwards reproduced in several other works, namely, as an addition to the description of Man, in the *Geographia Blaauwiana* and perhaps other works of a similar kind, lastly by the learned Langebek, in his *Scriptores rerum Danicarum medii œci*, Vol. III., accompanied by a vast number of excellent notes. Still, however, a complete edition was wanting, until one appeared in the „*Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ*", published at Copenhagen a. d. 1786, by the Rev. James Johnstone. This edition, however, is far from being good or accurate even in the most moderate meaning of the word. It is evident, that the person who copied the manuscript for the press, was not at all fit for the task, the errors committed by him being so numerous and even ridiculous [1]. All these errors I corrected, carefully comparing the edition with the original MS., during a short stay in London in the month of January, 1850; as, however, I did not think then of giving a new edition myself, and as my time was limited, I did not care for the less substantial things, as e. g. the orthographical peculiarities of the MS., especially as these were not at all different from the general character of manuscripts from that period. Nor did I minutely note down all bibliographical particulars, completely convinced by what I saw at the first glance, that the bulk of the MS. belonged to the beginning of the last half of the 13th century, or the

[1] As instances we may quote: ad ann. 1015 (i. e. 1032) the abbreviated „*presbiteris*" read as *probrosis* (ejectis probrosis secularibus!); ad ann. 1098 (p. 6. l. 3. from beneath) *verum etiam* read as *verumque;* ad ann. 1143 (p. 9 l. 7 from above) *ipso* read as *in proximo;* ad ann. 1144 (1154; p. 10 l. 3 from above) *ad dominum suum* read as *ad domum* —; ad ann. 1158 (p. 11 l. 13 from beneath) *misericordiam* read as *veniam,* besides many omissions and misreadings of names. Even the name of the English king, John (*Johannes*), is substituted by „*Riccardus*" ad a. d. 1210 (p. 15. last line), a curious blunder for an Englishman to make!

time about 1260. Afterwards, however, seeing that no new edition was likely to appear for some time to come, and convinced that I could furnish one from my corrected copy of Johnstone which might satisfy all claims of accuracy and usefulnes for all merely historical, not exactly bibliographical, purposes, I resolved to avail myself to this end of the opportunity afforded by the liberal and most praiseworthy habit adopted by our university, to publish editions of ancient national authors or other valuable literary works among the *Scripta Academica*. I deemed it necessary, however, to accompany the text with historical notes, thereby trying to correct its errors and supply its deficiencies as far as regards the period of time which it comprizes. As for the subsequent times, and even for contemporary matters not closely connected with the history of Man and the Isles proper, I have relinquished the task to more competent authors. Nor do I, on the whole, pretend to any completeness except in the explanations furnished from our own Sagas or national records; what I may have supplied from Scotch, English or Irish authors, are merely stray bits, occasionally snatched during the preparation to my chief work on the Norwegian history, and may no doubt receive large additions, if not even corrections, by British historians. As two of these I venture especially to name Mr. Cumming, whose description of Man I deplore having been unable to get, and Mr. J. F. Skene, whose excellent works „the Highlanders in Scotland" has afforded to me much information, without which I should often have been at a loss how to get on, and to which I refer those of my readers who might like to penetrate farther into the history of the Somerledian descendants, for information. I rejoice, however, in being able, by the kindness of the learned and distinguished Keeper of the Vatican Archive at Rome, the rev. Pater Theiner, to supply from this peerless collection several interesting and important records concerning Man and the Isles, hitherto entirely unknown, and here for the first time published. These, as well as others, extracted from *Rymeri Foedera*, and from Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, I give as *pièces justificatives* in an appendix, the order being of course strictly chronological. In these documents I have preserved the exact orthography such as it exists in the respective copies from which they are transcribed. In the Chronicle itself, however, from the reason stated above, the usual orthography in Latin books is

adopted, only the nouns proper are scrupulously copied from the codex letter by letter; the evident errors being marked by (?), or sometimes corrected, but the erroneous reading in this case always noticed in the notes. I regret only, that when comparing the edition of Johnstone with the original manuscript, I had not the time likewise to compare the records about the limits of the Russin lands, which Johnstone has published along with the Chronicle, and which might have furnished an interesting addition to the appendix. They are, however, of more interest to the topographer and the linguist than to the historian, and the want of them may therefore be less felt in an edition like this. Here I perform only the task of the historian, not of the antiquarian bibliographer.

Before taking leave of the reader, it is necessary to say some words about the different ways of spelling and pronouncing the names, especially of places occurring in the Chronicle, or elsewhere in our notes, or in narratives and records concerning Man and the Isles. They may be divided in two chief classes, those of Gaelic and those of not Gaelic origin, the most numerous among the latter being of course the Norwegian ones. As to the first class, the modern conventional way of spelling them, I suppose after the modern pronunciation, is very different from their spelling in Gaelic and what must even have been their pronunciation in the mediæval times, to judge from the way in which they are spelled in the Sagas, and which comes much nearer to the written Gaelic forms *Duncan*, f. inst., written in Gaelic *Donnchadh*, is written in the Sagas *Dungaðr* (*r* being only the masculine suffix); *Dugald*, in Gaelic *Dubhgall*, is written in the Sagas *Dufgall; Douald*, in Gaelic *Domhnall*, in the Sagas *Dofnaldr; Rory*, in Gaelic *Ruaidhri*, in the Sagas *Ruðri; Kenneth*, in Gaelic *Cionadh*, in the Sagas *Kynaðr* etc. In our Chronicle, as in most of the Latin records from those times, a middle course is followed between the original Gaelic spelling and the Anglo-Scottish pronunciation; as *Duncanus* (modern), *Dufgaldus* (more like the Gaelic), *Dompnaldus* (even so); *Muircertach* (in the Sagas *Myriartak*, *Muriartak*, or *Myrkjartan*), in modern spelling *Murcard*, is written partly *Murecardus*, *Murcardus*, partly *Murkartac; Angus* is written *Engus* as in the Sagas. As to the Norwegian names of men, *Haraldus*, *Olavus*, *Haco* are the forms commonly used in Latin records for *Haraldr*, *Ólafr*, *Hákon; Godredus* and

Reginaldus (sometimes *Raignaldus* and *Reginandus*) are the English forms for *Guðröðr* and *Rögnvaldr* or *Ragnvaldr; Sytric*, as in the Irish coins, for *Sigtryggr*. Of Gaelic names of places only very few are found in the Chronicle, and generally more like the forms given to them in the Sagas, than the modern ones, as *Galwedia* (Galloway), Norw. *Gaddgeðlar; Etholica* (Atholl), N. *Atjöklar*, *Both* (Bute) N. *Bót*, *Yle* (Isla) N. *Íl*. As to the Norwegian names of places, they are generally not much altered, as *Lodhus*, *Lodws*, *Leodus* (Lewis) N. *Ljóðhús*; *Ramsa*, *Ramso* (Ramsay in Man), N. *Hrafnsá*; *Santwat*, N. *Sandvað* (vadum arenosum), *Mirescog* or *Mirescoho*, N. *Mýriskógr; Ragnaldswath*, *Rognalwat*, *Ranaldwath*, N. *Rögnvaldsvað* (vadum Reginaldi), *Warchfell* (more correct *Warthfell*), N. *Varðfell* (the mountain of the beacon). The Isle of *Man* is called, as commonly in Latin records, *Mannia*; the Norwegian form *Mön* (which is also expressed in the Runic *Maun*) has only suffered the modification of the vowel indispensable in the nominative singular of feminine words, the original vowel of which is *a*, which always returns in the genitive, as *önd* (anima), gen. *andar;* so also *Mön*, gen. *Manar*. The other Islands, comprised under one denomination, are called in the Chronicle *Soderenses* or *Sodorenses*. This is a Latinization of the Norwegian name *Suðreyjar*, composed of *suðr* (i. e. south) and *eyjar* (i. e. islands), and meaning, therefore, properly *southern islands*, in opposition to the northern islands of Orkney, Shetland and Færey. In Latin, therefore, *insulæ australes* had been a more adequate and reasonable translation, *Soderenses* being almost nonsense, and having no doubt originated from people who did not understand the meaning of *suðr* (south), but believed it to be the name of a place, from which they could form a local adjective in the common way by adding the termination *-ensis*. To such a belief, at least, afterwards, the word *Sodorensis* has given birth in England, as the bishop of Man is always styled „Bishop of Sodor and Man“, the first name being no doubt thought by most people to design a place, while few, or none, dream of its meaning only „south“, and that the bishop is consequently styled „bishop of the South and Man.“ As the Islands, the *insulæ Sodorenses*, from which the name is derived, does not now any more belong to the diocese of Man, the bishop ought indeed entirely to drop this ridiculous addition, or at least change it into a more reasonable form. To us the form *Sudr-*

eys (from *Suðreyjar*), in analogy with *Orkneys* from *Orkneyjar*, seems to be most elegible and convenient to the English tongue; we have, therefore, ventured to adopt it in our notes, avoiding carefully the very common, but erroneous name of *Hebrides*, in which the syllable „*bri*" is only a misreading of *bu* in the name *Hebudæ*, *Hæbudæ*, *Æbudæ*, used by the ancient Latin writers.

I owe an explanation to my readers, why I have chosen to use the English language, which may seem strange in a work published in Norway, by a Norwegian, and among the *Scripta Academica* of the Norwegian university. As, however, the liberal statutes of the latter allow the use of any European language generally known, and the subject of the work is the history of provinces now and for many centuries forming a part of the British empire, I thought that the contents might not be without interest to English readers, and being sure, that all those of my countrymen who take an interest in these matters, are sufficiently familiar with the English language, while *vice versa* our language is very little understood in England, I preferred to use the medium convenient to the greater number of readers. Moreover, the Norwegian history, although affording so much light on that of England, Scotland and Ireland in the middle age, is so little known in those countries, and the ideas especially about the relation of the Sudreys, Orkneys and Shetland to the mother country of Norway so extremely confused[1] even among English and Scotch scholars, that I thought it might be worth while to use these means, if possible, of correcting some of their views and, perhaps, awaken their interest for further and deeper researches in the same rich and noble field. I am not quite without fear, nay, I am perfectly certain, that although a friend, whose modesty I will not hurt by naming him here, has shown me the kindness of going through my pages and modifying Norwegisms, my English will yet be found rather foreign by the greater part of my British readers; this consideration, however, ought not, as I thought, to deter me from an attempt which, if suc-

[1] As an instance of these confused ideas we need only refer to what is said in the notes about the battle of Largs, which even by writers of the better class is sometimes attributed to a Danish king, instead of a Norwegian one, and of which the ancient pagan cairns or cromlechs are believed to be monuments.

cessful in other respects, might produce some good results to the study of British as well as of Northern history.

I fear likewise, that the long distance of my present residence from my own country, which makes it quite out of question that I should be able to correct the proofs myself, and give the finishing touch to each sheet, may be found to have occasioned some inconveniences, and given rise to some faults or asperities, which might otherwise have been avoided. If, nevertheless, they might prove to be less numerous than expected, this is entirely due to the kind care of my friends at home (especially I feel it my duty here to mention the British Consul-general J. R. Crowe C. B.) who have taken upon themselves the tedious task not only of revising the proof-sheets, but also of filling up the blanks, which from want of the necessary books here in Rome, I have been compelled to make in a great number of quotations, writing only from memory, and especially not remembering the respective numbers of pages. To them, and to all, who have kindly contributed to make the inconvenience of my absence from the place where this book is printed, less felt, I offer my warmest thanks.

Rome, Oct. 4. 1859.

P. A. Munch.

Incipiunt chronica regum Manniæ et Insularum et episcoporum et quorundam regum Angliæ, Scotiæ, Norwegiæ.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini m°. (1017) Rex Cnutus filius Suani[1] totius Angliæ suscepit imperium. Postea, occiso Edwino clitone germano[2] regis Edmundi[3], filios regis ejusdem Edmundum et Edwardum ad Regem Suauorum occidendos misit. Qui nolens occidere pueros innocentes eos ad regem Hungariæ Salomonem misit, Edmundus autem processu temporis ibidem vitam finivit: Edwardus vero Agatham, filiam germani imperatoris Henrici, in matrimonium accepit, ex qua Margaretam, postea Scotorum reginam, et Christinam, sanctimonialem virginem, et clitonem Edgarum suscepit. Cnutus Rex duxit uxorem Emmam, ex qua suscepit Hardecnutum postea Danorum et Anglorum regem, et Gunnildam filiam quæ nupsit postea Henrico Romanorum Imperatori.

M°ij°. (1019) Cnutus rex Anglorum et Danorum Danmarc adiens ibidem per totam hyemem mansit gloriose.

Anno m°iij°. (1020). Rex Cnutus Angliam rediens magnum concilium apud Cyrecestrem in pascha tenuit.

Anno m°xi°. (1028), Rex Cnutus, cum .l. magnis navibus Norwegiam devectus Olavum regem de illa expulit, sibique eam subjugavit.

[1]) Correctum in Ms; antea „Suiorth". [2]) Sic emendatum a nobis sec. Chron. de Mailros. In ms. prave: „Edwino et Clitone germanis". [3]) „et" prave addit Ms.

Anno m^{o}xij^{o}. (1029). Cnutus rex Anglorum Danorum et Noreganorum rediit.

Anno m^{o}xiij^{o}. (1030). Sanctus Olavus rex, Haraldi regis filius, quem Cnutus expulerat, reversus est in Norwegiam, et injuste peremtus a Noreganis, glorioso coronatus martyrio, migravit ad Dominum.

Anno m^{o}xiiij^{o}. (1031). Rex Cnutus magno cum honore Romam profectus est, et ingentia munera in auro et argento Sancto Petro obtulit, et ut schola Anglorum libera esset a Johanne papa impetravit.

Anno m^{o}xv^{o}. (1032). Ecclesia sancti Edmundi regis et martyris dedicata est, in qua rex Cnutus communi consilio præsulum et optimatum suorum ejectis presbyteris sæcularibus monachos imposuit. Eodem anno ignis inexstinguibilis multa per Angliam loca cremavit.

Anno m^{o}xvij^{o}. (1034). Malcolm Rex Scotorum obiit, cui Duncan successit in regnum.

Anno m^{o}xviij^{o}. (1035). Cnutus rex Anglorum ante suum obitum super Noreganos Suuanum filium suum constituit, super Danos Hardecnutum filium et Emmæ reginæ filium regem locavit; super Anglos vero Haraldum filium suum ex Hamtunensi Elfiva procreatum. Postea vero Cnutus rex Idus Novembris apud Sceaftesburiam præsenti vita decessit. Wintoniæ in veteri monasterio satis honorifice tumulatur. Non multo post tamen regnum Angliæ inter Haraldum et Hardecnutum dividitur. Eodem anno Robertus dux Normanniæ obiit, cui successit filius ejus Willelmus Bastard puer.

Anno m^{o}xx^{o}ij^{o}. (1037). Haraldus, rex Merciorum et Norhumorum (!), eligitur ut per totam Angliam regnaret, spreto fratre suo Hardecnuto, quia nimium in Danmarc morabatur.

Anno m^{o}xx^{o}iij^{o}. (1040). Obiit Haraldus rex Lundonis, et in Uestmuster sepelitur, cui Hardecnutus successit.

Anno m^{o}xx^{o}vij^{o}. (1046). Magnus rex Norwegiæ sancti Olaui regis filius, fugato rege Danorum Suano, Danmarc sibi subjugavit.

Anno m^{o}xx^{o}viij^{o}. (1047). Magnus Rex cum Suano prælium commisit, illum de Dannemarc expulit, et in illa regnavit, ac non multo post obiit.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxx^oix^o}$. (1048). Suanus Danmarchiam iterum recepit, et Haraldus Harphagre regis Sywardi filius Norwegiam recepit. Ipse vero ex parte matris frater sancti Olavi erat, patruus scilicet Magni regis. Hic cum Anglorum rege per nuncios suos pacem fecit. Eodem anno terræ motus magnus exstitit.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxxx^ov^o}$. (1054). Dux Norhymbriorum Sywardus jussu regis Eduuini Scotiam cum multo exercitu intrans prælium cum rege Scotiæ Mactheath (!) commisit, illumque fugavit, et Malcolmum, ut rex jusserat, regem constituit.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxxx^ovi^o}$. $\mathrm{m^oxxx^ovij}$. $\mathrm{m^oxxx^oviij^o}$. $\mathrm{m^oxxx^oix^o}$. $\mathrm{m^ox^ol^o}$. $\mathrm{m^ox^oli^o}$. $\mathrm{m^oxl^oij}$. $\mathrm{m^oxl^oiij^o}$. $\mathrm{m^oxl^oiv^o}$. nihil memoriæ.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxl^ov}$. (1064). Norualorum rex Grifinus a suis interficitur, caputque ejus cum ornatura comiti Haraldo mittitur, quod mox ille regi Edwardo detulit. Rex vero Edwardus terram ipsius duobus fratribus suis concessit.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxl^ovi^o}$.

Anno $\mathrm{m^oxl^ovij^o}$. (1066). Obiit piæ memoriæ Edwardus rex Angliæ, de quo dicitur, quod erat honor et gloria Anglorum dum vixit, et eorundem ruina dum moritur. Cui successit in regnum Haraldus filius Goduini, contra quem Haraldus Harfager rex Norwegiæ prælium commisit apud Stamfordbrige; et Angli victores existentes maximam cladem Norwegientium fecerunt, et omnes in fugam compulerunt. De qua fuga quidam Godredus cognomento Crouan filius Haraldi nigri de Ysland fugiens venit ad Godredum filium Sytric qui tunc regnavit in Mannia, et honorifice susceptus est ab eo. Eodem anno Willelmus Bastard Angliam debellavit, Haraldum regem occidit, et pro eo regnavit, et Anglos perpetuæ servituti subdidit. Præfuit autem genti Anglorum annis .xxti, mensibus .xi, cui successit filius ejus.

Anno $\mathrm{m^ol^oi^o}$. (1070). Malcolmus rex Scotiæ Angliam vastavit usque Clibland et Margaretam in matrimonium accepit. Eodem anno obiit Godredus filius Sytric rex Manniæ, cui successit filius ejus Fingal.

Anno autem $\mathrm{m^ol^ovi^o}$. (1075) Godredus Crouan collegit multitudinem navium et venit ad Manniam, prælium cum populo terræ commisit, sed superatus et fugatus est. Iterum exercitum et naves coadunavit, venit ad Manniam, pugnavit cum Mannensibus, victus

et fugatus est. Tertio congregavit multitudinem copiosam et venit noctu ad portum, qui vocatus est Ramsa, et trecentos viros occultavit in silva, quæ erat in devexo montis supercilio, qui vocatur Scacafel. Orto lucis sidere, Mannenses construxerunt aciem suam, et magno impetu facto congressi sunt cum Godredo. Cumque pugna vehemens esset, trecenti viri, surgentes de insidiarum loco a tergo, Mannenses debilitare coeperunt et in fugam compellere. Cum autem vidissent se superatos, nec aliquem diffugii sibi locum patere, — nam reuma maris Ramso amnis alveum impleverat — et hostes ex altera parte constantes se persequentes, qui tunc remanserant, clamore miserabili postulabant a Godredo vitam sibi donari. Ille autem flexus misericordia et miserans calamitatem eorum, quum apud ipsos per aliquod tempus nutritus fuerat, revocavit exercitum, et prohibuit ne eos diutius persequerentur. Godredus sequenti die optionem exercitui suo dedit, vel si mallent Manniam inter se dividere et in ea habitare, vel cunctam substantiam terræ accipere, et ad propria remeare. Illis autem magis placuit totam insulam vastare et de bonis illius ditari, et sic ad propria reverti. Godredus autem paucis qui secum remanserant de insulanis australem partem insulæ, et reliquiis Mannensium aquilonarem tali pacto concessit, ut nemo eorum aliquando auderet jure hæreditario sibi aliquam partem terræ usurpare. Unde accidit ut usque in hodiernum diem tota insula solius regis sit, et omnes redditus ejus ad ipsum pertineant.

Igitur Godredus subjugavit sibi Dubliniam et magnam partem de Laynestir. Scotos vero ita perdomuit, ut nullus qui fabricaret navem vel scapham ausus esset plus quam tres clavos inserere. Regnavit autem sexdecem annos et mortuus est in insula quæ vocatur Yle. Reliquit sane tres filios, Lagmannum, Haraldum, et Olavum. Lagmannus major natu, regnum arripiens, septem annos regnavit. Rebellavit autem contra eum Haraldus frater ejus multo tempore. Sed tandem captus a Lagmanno, genitalibus et oculis privatus est. Post hæc Lagmannus poenitens, quod fratris sui oculos eruisset, sponte regnum suum dimisit, et signo crucis dominicæ insignitus, iter Jerosolimitanum arripuit, quo et mortuus est.

Anno m°l°xx°iij°. (1093). Occisus est Malcolmus rex Scotiæ ab Anglis, cui successit Duncanus. Eodem anno obiit piæ memoriæ Margareta regina Scotiæ.

Anno m°l°xx°v°. (1095). Omnes proceres insularum audientes mortem Lagmanni, miserunt legatos ad Murecardum Obrien regem Yberniæ, postulantes ut aliquem virum industrium de regali stirpe in regem eis mitteret, donec Olavus filius Godredi cresceret. Annuit eis Rex libentissime, et quendam Dompnaldum filium Tadc ad eos misit, monens et præcipiens ei, quatinus cum omni benignitate et modestia regnum, quod sibi non debebatur, gubernaret. Sed ille postquam ad regnum pervenit, parvi pendens præcepta domini sui, cum magna tyrannide abusus est regno, et multis sceleribus perpetratis, tribus annis enormiter regnavit. Tunc omnes principes insularum una conspiratione commoti, adversus eum congregati sunt, et expulerunt a finibus suis. Ille autem fugiens ad Yberniam, non est ultra reversus ad eas.

Anno m°l°xx°vij°. (1097). Quidam Ingemundus missus est a rege Norwegiæ, ut regnum insularum arriperet. Cumque ad insulam Leodus pervenisset, misit nuncios ad omnes principes insularum, præcipiens quatinus in unum convenirent et constituerent eum regem. Interim vero ipse cum sociis suis rapinis et comessationibus vacabat, mulierum et puellarum pudicitiam violabat, et ceteris voluptatibus et carnis illecebris operam dabat. Cumque hæc nunciata fuissent principibus insularum, jam in unum ad constituendum eum regem congregatis, nimio succensi furore properaverunt ad eum, et supervenientes nocte, domum in qua erat combusserunt, et eum cum omnibus suis partim ferro, partim flammis exstinxerunt.

Anno m°xc°viij°. (1098). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Cystercii[1]. Antiochia a Christianis capta est et cometa apparuit. Cometa est stella, quæ non omni tempore, sed maxime autem in obitu regis aut in excidio religionis apparet. Eodem anno commissum est prælium inter Mannenses apud Santwat, et aquilonares victoriam obtinuerunt. In quo bello occisi sunt Other comes, et Macmaras, principes ambarum partium.

[1]) In margine delinatio domus cum duabus turribus.

Eodem anno Magnus rex Norwegiæ filius Olavi filii Haraldi Harfagre, volens explorare incorruptionem sancti Olavi regis & martyris, præcepit ut ejus mausolium (!) aperiretur. Episcopo autem et Clero resistente, ipse rex audacter accessit, et vi regia aperiri sibi scrinium fecit. Cumque et oculis vidisset, et manibus attrectasset incorruptum corpus, subito timor magnus irruit in eum, et cum magna festinatione discessit. Sequenti nocte Olavus rex et martyr ei per visum apparuit, dicens: „Elige tibi, in„quam, unum ex duobus, vel vitam cum regno infra triginta dies „amittere, vel a Norvegia decedere, et eam amplius nunquam „videre.“ Expergefactus rex a somno, vocavit ad se principes et majores natu, et exposuit eis visionem. Illi autem conterriti, hoc consilium dederunt ei, ut cum omni festinatione de Norvegia exiret. Ille sine mora coadunari fecit classem centum sexaginta navium, et ad Orcades insulas transfretavit, quas sibi statim subjugavit et transitum faciens per universas insulas easque sibi subjiciens pervenit usque ad Manniam. Cumque applicuisset ad insulam sancti Patricii, venit videre locum pugnæ, quam Mannenses paulo ante inter se commiserant, quia adhuc multa corpora occisorum inhumata eraut. Videns autem insulam pulcherrimam, placuit in oculis ejus, eamque sibi in habitationem elegit, munitiones in ea construxit, quæ usque hodie ex ejus nomine nuncupantur. Galwedienses ita constrinxit, ut cogeret eos materias lignorum cædere et ad litus portare ad munitiones construendas. Ad Moiniam (!) insulam Walliæ navigavit, et duos Hugones comites invenit in ea; unum occidit, alterum fugavit, et insulam sibi subjugavit. Wallenses vero multa munera ei præbuerunt, et valedicens eis ad Manniam remeavit. Murecardo regi Yberniæ misit calceamenta sua, præcipiens ei ut ea super humeros suos in die natalis Domini per medium domus suæ portaret in conspectu nunciorum ejus, quatinus intelligeret se subjectum esse Magno regi. Quod audientes Ybernenses, ægre ferebant, et indignati sunt nimis. Sed rex saniori consilio usus, non solum, inquit, calceamenta ejus portare, verum etiam manducare mallem, quam Magnus rex unam provinciam in Ybernia destrueret. Itaque complevit præceptum et nuncios honoravit. Multa

quoque munera per eos Magno regi transmisit, et foedus composuit. Nuncii vero redeuntes ad dominum suum narraverunt ei de situ Yberniæ et amoenitate, de frugum fertilitate et aeris salubritate. Magnus vero hæc audiens, nihil cogitabat quam totam Yberniam sibi subjugare. Itaque præcepit classem congregare, ipse vero cum sexdecim navibus procedens, explorare volens terram, cum incaute a navibus discessisset, subito ab Ybernensibus circumvallatus, interiit cum omnibus fere qui secum erant. Sepultus est autem juxta ecclesiam Sancti Patricii in Dun. Regnavit autem in regno insularum sex annis. Quo mortuo, miserunt principes insularum propter Olavum filium Godredi Crouan, de quo superius mentionem fecimus, qui tunc temporis degebat in curia Henrici regis Angliæ filii Willelmi, et adduxerunt eum.

Anno m^{o}c^{o}ij^{o}. (1102). Olavus filius Godredi Crouan coepit regnare super omnes insulas, regnavitque .xl.ta annis. Erat autem vir pacificus, habuitque omnes reges Yberniæ et Scotiæ ita sibi confoederatos, ut nullus auderet perturbare regnum insularum omnibus diebus ejus. Accepit autem uxorem Affricam nomine filiam Fergus de Galwedia, de qua genuit Godredum. Habuit et concubinas plures, de quibus filios tres, scilicet Reignaldum, Lagmannum et Haraldum, et filias multas generavit, quarum una nupsit Sumerledo regulo Herergaidel, quæ fuit causa ruinæ totius regni insularum. Genuit namque ex ea filios .iiij., Dubgallum, Raignaldum, Engus et Olavum, de quibus latius in sequentibus dicemus.

Anno m^{o}c^{o}xij^{o}. (1112). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Sauiniensis.

Anno m^{o}c^{o}xx^{o}vj^{o}. (1126). Obiit Alexander Rex Scotiæ, cui successit David frater ejus. Eodèm anno fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Furnes.

Anno m^{o}c^{o}xxx^{o}iij^{o} (1133). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Riuallis. Eodem anno eclipsis solis facta est quarto nonas Augusti, feria quarta, ita ut dies in noctem verteretur aliquamdiu.

Anno m^{o}c^{o}xxx^{o}iv^{o}. (1134). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Caldra. Eodem anno Olavus rex dedit Yvoni abbati dè

Furnes partem terræ suæ in Mannia ad Abbatiam constituendam, in loco qui vocatur Russin; deditque ecclesiis insularum terras et libertates; et erat circa cultum divinum devotus et fervidus, tam deo quam hominibus acceptabilis, præter quod plus isti domestico vitio regum indulgebat.

Anno m°c°xxx°vj°. (1135). Obiit Henricus rex Angliæ, et Stephanus comes Boloniæ nepos ejus successit in regnum, et in die coronationis suæ ad missam oblita est pax dari populo.

Anno m°c°xxx°ix°. (1139). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Malros. Eodem anno commissum est bellum de Standarath inter Anglos et Scotos, et Scoti victi fugerunt.

Anno m°c°xl°. (1140). Obiit sanctus Malachias episcopus et legatus Yberniæ apud Claram Vallem, sepultusque est in oratorio beatæ virginis Mariæ, in quo sibi bene complacuit.

Anno m°c°xli°. (1141). Fundata est abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Holm Coltran.

Anno m°c°xl°ij° (1142). Godredus filius Olavi transfretavit ad regem Norvegiæ, cui nomen erat Hinge, et hominium suum ei fecit, et moratus est apud eum, honorifice susceptus ab eo. Eodem anno tres filii Haraldi fratris Olavi, qui nutriti fuerant apud Dubliniam, congregantes magnam turbam hominum et omnes profugas regis, venerunt ad Manniam postulantes ab eodem rege medietatem totius regni insularum sibi dari. Rex autem cum audisset, placare eos volens, respondit super hoc consilium se habiturum; cumque diem et locum constituissent, ubi concilium haberi debuisset, interim illi nequissimi de morte regis inter se tractabant. Constituta autem die convenerunt utræque partes in portu, qui vocatur Ramsa, sederuntque seriatim rex cum suis ex una parte, illi vero cum suis ex altera. Reginaldus autem medianus frater, qui eum percussurus erat, stabat seorsim loquens cum quodam viro de principibus terræ. Cumque vocatus venisset ad regem, vertens se ad eum quasi salutans eum, securim fulgentem in altum levavit, et caput regis uno ictu amputavit. Perpetrato autem tanto scelere statim terram diviserunt inter se. Paucis diebus transactis, congregata classe, transfretaverunt ad Galwediam, volentes sibi subjugare. Galwedienses autem conglobati et magno impetu facto, congressi sunt cum eis. Illi statim

terga vertentes, fugerunt cum magna confusione ad Manniam, omnesque Galwedienses, qui in ea habitabant, quosdam jugulaverunt, alios expulerunt.

Anno m°c°xl°iij°. (1153). Obiit beatæ memoriæ Bernardus primus Abbas Clarevallis. Eodem anno obiit David rex Scotiæ, cui successit Malcolm nepos ejus, more regio in regem sullimatus. Ipso anno occisus est Olavus rex, sicut supra diximus, in die sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli. In proximo autumno venit Godredus[1] filius ejus de Norvegia cum quinque navibus, et applicuit apud Orcadas. Omnes autem principes insularum, audientes eum venisse, gavisi sunt, et convenientes in unum, ipsum unanimiter elegerunt sibi regem. Godredus igitur ad Manniam veniens tres filios Haraldi comprehendit, et in ultionem patris sui digna morte multavit. Fertur etiam, quod duorum oculos eruit, et unum occidit.

Anno m°c°xl°iv°. (1154) Coepit regnare Godredus et .xxxta tribus annis regnavit. De quo multa memoriæ digna narrari potuissent, quæ nos brevitatis causa omisimus. Tertio anno regni sui miserunt propter illum Dublinienses, ut regnaret super se. Qui, collecta navium multitudine et copioso exercitu, Dubliniam venit, et gratanter a civibus cum magno tripudio susceptus est. Paucis vero diebus interjectis, communi consilio et consensu eum in regem sullimarunt. Quod cum audisset Murcardus rex Yberniæ, collecta innumerabili multitudine Hyberniensium, properavit versus Dubliniam, ut Godredum expelleret et eam sibi subjugaret. Cum venisset prope civitatem quæ vocatur Cortcelis[2], ibidem fixis tentoriis permansit. Crastino die elegit tria millia equitum, quibus præfecit fratrem suum couterinum nomine Osiblen, et misit eum cum prædictis equitibus ad civitatem ut colloquium cum civibus haberet, simul etiam ut virtutem eorum exploraret. Cum autem appropinquarent civitati, Godredus cum suis et omnes cives Dubliniæ grandi cum strepitu exeuntes et magno impetu facto irruerunt in eos, et tanto imbre telorum eos debilitare coeperunt, ut continuo eos terga vertere

[1]) in Cod. „Dodredus." [2]) Aut „Cortcelis". Recentiori manu scriptum, priori nomine, quidquid fuerit, eraso.

coegissent. Osiblen autem frater Regis, cum audaciter resistere conaretur, circumseptus ab hostibus cum multis aliis interiit. Ceteri beneficio cornipedum evaserunt. Cum ad dominum suum revertissent, totum [1]ordine ei retulerunt. Rex autem cum audisset fratrem suum esse occisum, inconsolabili dolore luxit eum, et præ nimia tristitia præcepit exercitibus suis ut redirent unusquisque ad loca sua. Godredus vero post paucos dies reversus est in Manniam, dimisitque omnes principes insularum redire ad propria. Cumque vidisset regnum confirmatum esse sibi, nullumque ei posse resistere, coepit tyrannidem exercere contra principes suos; nam quosdam eorum exhæreditavit, alios de dignitatibus ejecit, quorum unus nomine Thorfinus filius Oter, ceterisque potentior, accessit ad Sumerledum, et postulavit ab eo Dubgallum filium suum ut constitueret eum regem super insulas. Audiens hæc Sumerledus gavisus est valde, et tradidit ei Dubgallum filium suum, qui assumens eum circumduxit per omnes insulas, et subjugavit ei universas, accipiens obsides de singulis. Unus vero princeps Paulus nomine clam fugiens venit ad Godredum, et narravit ei omnia quæ gesta fuerant. Audiens hæc Godredus consternatus est mente, et continuo præcepit suis naves præparare, et festinanter ire eis obviam. Sumerledus vero cum suis collegit classem octoginta navium, et properavit obviam Godredo.

Anno m°c°l°vi°. (1156). Commissum est navale prælium inter Godredum et Sumerledum in nocte epiphaniæ Domini, et magna strages hominum ex utraque parte facta est. Cum autem dies illucesceret, pacificati sunt; et diviserunt inter se regnum insularum, factumque est regnum bipartitum a die illa usque in præsens tempus; et hæc fuit causa ruinæ regni insularum, ex quo filii Sumerledi occupaverunt illud.

Anno m°c°l°viij°. (1158). Venit Sumerledus in Manniam cum quinquaginta tribus navibus, et commisit prælium cum Godredo, et fugavit eum, et totam insulam vastavit, et abiit. Godredus vero transfretavit ad Norwegiam quærere auxilium contra Sumerledum.

Licet hic introserere quoddam miraculum de sancto Machuto confessore Domini.

Eodem tempore, cum adhuc Sumerledus esset in Mannia in portu

[1]) Vacuum spatiolum.

quæ vocatur Ramso, nuntiatum est exercitui eius ecclesiam Sancti Machuti multis pecuniis esse refertam; hic enim locus omnibus ad se confugientibus propter reverentiam sanctissimi confessoris sui Machuti cunctis periculis tutum refugium existebat. Unus autem ex principibus ceteris potentior, Gillocolmus nomine, suggessit Sumerledo de prædictis pecuniis, nihilque pertinere asserebat ad sancti Machuti pacem, si ea animalia, quæ extra ambitum coemiterii pascebantur, ad victum exercitus ducerentur. At Sumerledus negare coepit, dicens se nullo modo posse permittere sancti Machuti pacem violari. E contra Gillocolmus instabat magnis precibus, postulans ut sibi cum suis daretur licentia eundi illuc, et reatum sibi imputari concessit. Quo audito Sumerledus, licet invitus, permisit ei et dixit: „Inter te et sanctum Machutum sit, ego et exercitus meus innocentes erimus, „nec prædæ vestræ participationem curamus.“ Tunc Gillocolmus lætus effectus venit ad suos, convocatisque tribus filiis suis et universis suis clientibus, præcepit ut ea nocte omnes essent parati, quatinus primo diluculo, facto impetu, irruerent ex improviso super ecclesiam sancti Machuti, quæ inde ad duo milliaria distabat. Rumor interim pervenit ad ecclesiam de adventu hostium; qui omnes tanto terrore perculit, ut multi ex populo qui ibi erant fugerent de ecclesia, et in abditis rupium et specubus se occultarent. Cetera mutitudo, infinitis clamoribus, tota nocte misericordiam dei per merita sancti Machuti implorabant. Sexus vero infirmior, dissolutis crinibus, ejulantes, discurrebant circa parietes ecclesiæ, magnis vocibus clamantes: „Ubi es modo „Machute, ubi sunt miracula tua quæ usque nunc operabaris in „loco isto? numquid propter peccata nostra nunc discedes, et „derelinques populum tuum in tali angustia? Et, si non propter „nos, saltem propter honorem nominis tui hac vice nos adjuva!“ His, et hujuscemodi vocibus, motus, ut credimus, sanctus Machutus, eorum miseriis misertus, eos de instanti periculo liberavit, et hostem eorum atroci genere mortis damnavit. Nam prædictus Gillo-Colmus cum se sopori dedisset in tentorio suo, apparuit ei sanctus Machutus toga candida præcinctus, baculumque pastoralem manu tenens. Cumque ante lectum ejus astaret, his eum verbis

aggreditur: „Quid“, inquit, mihi et tibi est Gillo-Colme? Quid „tibi aut tuis nocui quia nunc disponis locum meum prædari?“ Ad hæc Gillo-Colmus respondit: „Quis“, inquit, „es tu?“ At ille ait: „Ego sum servus Christi Machutus, cujus tu ecclesiam contaminari conaris, sed non proficies.“ Quo dicto, baculum, quem manu tenuerat, in sublime erexit, et punctum ei per cor illius transfixit. At ille miser diro clamore emisso omnes qui circumquaque in papilionibus erant somno excussit. Iterum Sanctus eum transfixit, iterum ipse clamavit. Tertio Sanctus idem fecit, tertio ille clamavit. Filii vero ejus et omnes sui his clamoribus turbati accurrunt ad eum, sciscitantes quidnam ei acciderat. At ille vix linguam movere valens, cum gemitu dixit: „Sanctus Machutus hic affuit, meque tribus ictibus baculo suo „transfigens occidit. Sed ite citius ad ecclesiam ejus, et adducite baculum et presbyteros et clericos, ut intercedant pro me „ad sanctum Machutum, si forsitan indulgeat mihi quæ adversus „eum facere diposui.“ Qui celeriter jussa complentes rogaverunt clericos ut sumpto baculo sancti Machuti secum visitarent dominum suum qui jam in extremis esse videbatur. Narraverunt autem eis omnia quæ ei contigerant. Audientes hæc presbyteri et clerici et cetera multitudo, gavisi sunt gaudio magno, miseruntque cum eis quosdam ex clericis cum baculo. Qui cum coram eo stetissent, videntes eum jam pene exanimem, nam paulo ante loquelam amiserat, unus clericorum imprecatus est dicens: „Sanctus Machaldus“, inquit, „qui te coepit punire, non desistat do- „nec te ad interitum ducat, ut ceteri videntes et audientes discant „locis sanctis majorem reverentiam præbere.“ Quibus dictis clerici ad sua sunt reversi, post quorum discessum coepit tanta multitudo muscarum grandium et tetrarum circa faciem ejus et ora volitare, ut non poterant nec ipse nec qui ei assisterant (!) eas abigere. Sic cum magnis tormentis et cruciatibus circa sextam diei horam expiravit. Quo defuncto tantus terror invasit Sumerledum et exercitum ejus, ut statim, accedente maris reumate, et navibus fluitantibus, amoverent classem de portu illo, sicque cum summa festinatione ad proprias terras sunt reversi.

Anno m°c°lx°iv°. (1164). Sumerledus collegit classem centum

sexaginta navium, et applicuit apud Rinfriu, volens totam Scotiam sibi subjugare. Sed ultione divina a paucis superatus, cum filio suo et innumerabili populo ibidem occisus est. Eodem anno bellum fuit apud Ramso inter Reginaldum fratrem Godredi et Mannenses; et propter dolum cujusdam Vicecomitis, Mannenses in fugam conversi sunt et Reginaldus coepit regnare. Quarto autem die supervenit Godredus de Norwegia cum magna multitudine armatorum, et fratrem suum Reginaldum comprehendit, et oculis et genitalibus privavit. Eodem anno obiit Malcolmus Rex Scotiæ, et frater ejus Willelmus ei successit in regnum.

Anno m°c°lx°vi° (1166). Duo cometæ apparuerunt ante solis ortum mense Augusti, unus ad austrum, altera ad aquilonem.

Anno m°c°lxx°i°. (1171). Richardus comes de Penbroc transfretavit in Yberniam, et Dubliniam cum magna parte Yberniæ subjugavit.

Anno m°c°lxx°i°. (1171). Henricus rex Angliæ fecit coronari filium suum Henricum puerum in regem apud Lundoniam .xi. kal. Junii, et in die Dominica consecrari a Rogero usurpatore Eboracensi archiepiscopo; qui in alienam provinciam jus et officium alienum contra canones per regis et propriam tyrannidem, vivente venerabili Thoma Archiepiscopo Cantuariæ et in Galliis exulante, sibi usurpavit. Eodem anno, in festivitate apostolorum Petri et Pauli, subito terræ motus ingens et horrendus factus est.

Anno m°c°lxx°i°. (1171). Beatæ memoriæ Thomas Cantuariæ Archiepiscopus et apostolicæ sedis legatus, Primas totius Angliæ, verus Christi martyr, pro justitia in ecclesia suæ sedis detruncatus est.

Anno m°c°lxx°vi°. (1176). Johannes de Cursi sibi subjugavit Ultoniam. Eodem anno Vivianus, apostolicæ sedis legatus Cardinalis, venit in Manniam, et legationis suæ officium complens Godredum regem legitime desponsari fecit cum uxore sua nomine Phingola, filia Mac Loclen filii Murkartac regis Yberniæ, matre scilicet Olavi qui tunc triennis erat. Desponsavit autem eos Silvanus Abbas de Rieualis. Ipsa die Godredus rex dedit in oblationem venerabili Abbati Silvano partem terræ apud Mi-

rescog, ubi mox monasterium construxit; sed processu temporis terra tota cum monachis concessa est abbatiæ Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno m°c°lxx°ij°. (1182). Reginaldus filius Eacmarcat in Manniam veniens, quidam scilicet vir de regali genere, cum magna turba hominum, absente rege, primo congressu quosdam qui litora custodiebant fugavit, et occidit ex iis circiter .xxti. homines. Postea vero eadem die congregati Mannenses in unum ei viriliter occurrerunt, ipsumque cum omnibus pene suis occiderunt.

Anno m°c°l°xxx°iij°. (1183). Obiit Fogolt Vicecomes de Mannia.

Anno m°c°l°xxx°v°. (1185). Sol passus est eclipsim in die apostolorum Philippi et Jacobi ita ut stellæ apparerent.

Anno m°c°lxxx°vij°. (1187). Capta est Ierusalem a paganis, et Sancta Crux sublata est Damascum. Eodem anno obiit Godredus rex insularum .iiij°. idus Novembris in insula Sancti Patricii in Mannia. Prima vero æstate translatum est corpus ejus ad insulam quæ vocatur Hy. Reliquit sane tres filios, Reginaldum, Olavum et Yvarum. Reginaldus robustus tunc juvenis fuit in insulanis partibus, Olavus vero tenellus adhuc puer morabatur in Mannia.

Godredus, dum adhuc viveret, Olavum filium suum regni hæredem constituit, quia ad ipsum jure spectabat hæreditas, nam de legitimo matrimonio natus fuit, præcepitque omni Manensi populo, ut eum post suum obitum, sicut decebat, regem constituerent, atque irrefragabile conservarent ei suæ fidei juramentum. Sed mortuo Godredo Mannenses legatos suos ad insulas propter Reginaldum miserant, quia vir strenuus et fortioris ætatis fuerat, et eum sibi regem constituerunt. Timebant vero imbecillitatem[1] Olavi, utpote decennis pueri, et arbitrabantur, quod is qui se propter ætatis teneritudinem regere nesciebat, subjectum sibi populum gubernare minime potuisset. Et hæc fuit causa pro qua Mannensis populus Reginaldum sibi regem constituit.

[1]) Spatiolum vacuum.

Anno m°c°lxxx°viij°. (1188). Reginaldus filjus Godredi coepit regnare super insulas. Eodem anno occisus est Murcardus vir potens et strenuus in omni regno insularum.

Anno m°c°lxxx°ix°. (1189). Obiit Henricus rex Angliæ, cui successit Ricardus filius ejus. Eodem anno obiit Rodolfus, Abbas de Furnes, in Mellefonte.

Anno m°c°xc°. (1190). Philippus rex Franciæ et Ricardus rex Angliæ profecti sunt Ierusalem cum magnis exercitibus.

Anno m°c°xc°ij°. (1192). Commissum est bellum inter filios Sumerledi Reginaldum et Engus, in quo bello multi vulnerati corruerunt. Engus tamen victoriam obtinuit. Eodem anno Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin translata est ad Dufglas, ibique per quatuor annos habitantes iterum ad Russin reversi sunt.

Anno m°c°xc°iij°. (1193). Ricardus rex Angliæ reversus est ab Jerosolimis, et in Almannia captus est; pro cujus redemptione Anglia persolvit centum millia marcharum.

Anno m°cx°c°iij°. (1193). Obiit Michael episcopus insularum apud Fontanas, cui successit Nicholaus in episcopatum.

Anno m°cc°iiij°. (1204). Hugo de Lacy venit cum exercitu Ultoniam et commisit bellum cum Johanne de Cursi, eumque comprehendit et vinculis mancipavit, et Ultoniam sibi subjugavit. Postea vero Johannem liberum ire permisit. Qui cum dimissus esset venit ad regem Reginaldum, a quo honorifice susceptus est, quia erat gener ejus. Johannes quidem de Cursi habuit filiam Godredi, nomine Affricam, in matrimonium, quæ fundavit Abbatiam Sanctæ Mariæ de Jugo Dei, quæ ibidem sepulta est.

Anno m°cc°v°. (1205). Johannes de Cursi iterum resumptis viribus congregavit copiosam multitudinem, sed et Reginaldum regem Insularum cum centum ferme navibus secum duxit ad Ultoniam. Cumque applicuissent in portum qui vocatur Stranfeord, segniter obsederunt castellum de Rath. Supervenit autem Walterus de Lacy cum exercitu magno, et eos cum magna confusione fugavit, ex quo tempore Johannes de Cursi nunquam terram suam recuperavit.

Anno m°cc°x°. (1210). Engus filius Sumerledi cum tribus filiis suis occisus est. Eodem anno Johannes rex Angliæ clas-

sem quingentarum navium ad Yberniam duxit, eamque sibi subjugavit, et mittens partem exercitus sui cum comite quodam nomine Fulco ad Manniam, eam in una quindena fere omnino devastaverunt, et suscipientes obsides ex ea reversi sunt in patriam suam. Reginaldus autem rex et optimates ejus non erant in Mannia.

Anno m°cc°xvii°. (1217). Obiit Nicolaus episcopus insularum, et sepultus est in Ultonia in domo de Benchor, cui successit Reginaldus in episcopatu.

Libet adhuc, ad ædificationem legentium, de gestis Reginaldi et Olavi fratrum aliquid compendiosius retexere.

Reginaldus dedit fratri suo Olavo insulam quandam quæ vocatur Lodhus, quæ ceteris insulis latior esse dicitur, sed raris colitur incolis, quod montuosa et saxosa sit, et tota fere inarabilis. Incolæ vero illius plerumque de venatione et piscatura vivunt. Ad hanc ergo insulam possidendam Olavus profectus est, et habitavit in ea, pauperem ducens vitam. Cumque vidisset eam ad sustentationem suam et sui exercitus minime sufficere, accessit fiducialiter ad Reginaldum fratrem suum, qui tunc morabatur in insulis, et sic allocutus est eum; „Frater“, inquit, „et domine mi rex, tu nosti quod regnum insularum ad me jure „hæreditario pertinuit, sed quia Dominus ad hoc gubernandum „te elegerat, non invideo tibi, nec moleste fero, te esse in regali „culmine sullimatum. Nunc ergo te deprecor, ut provideas mihi „aliquam portionem terræ in insulis, in qua honeste cum meis „possim vivere; nam insula Lodhus, quam mihi dedisti, me sustentare non valet.“ Quod cum audiisset frater ejus Reginaldus, habiturum se cum suis super hoc promittebat consilium; et crastina die ei super hac petitione sua responsurum. Cum crastina dies illuxisset, et Olavus vocatus venisset ad colloquium Reginaldi, iussit eum Reginaldus comprehendi et catenis vinciri, vinctumque duci ad Willelmum regem Scotiæ, ut penes ipsum in carcere servaretur; quod ita factum est, fuitque Olavus catenatus in carcere regis Scotiæ fere septem annis. Septimo autem anno obiit Willelmus rex Scotiæ, cui successit Alexander filius eius, qui antequam moreretur, jussit ut omnes vincti, qui

apud eum carceribus tenebantur, liberarentur. Olavus igitur liberatus a vinculis et suæ redditus libertati venit ad Manniam ad Reginaldum fratrem suum, moxque cum non modico comitatu virorum nobilium ad Sanctum Jacobum profectus est; rediensque de peregrinatione venit iterum ad Reginandum (!) fratrem suum, et pacifice susceptus est ab eo. Ipso tempore fecit Reginaldus Olavum fratrem suum desponsare uxorem filiam cujusdam nobilis de Kentyre, germanam uxoris suæ, nomine Lauon, deditque ei Lodhus prædictam insulam in possessionem, profectusque est Olavus cum uxore sua, valedicens fratri suo, et habitavit in Lodhus.

Post aliquantos autem dies Reginandus(!) episcopus insularum, qui successit Nicholao Episcopo, venit ad insulanas partes ut visitaret ecclesias. Cui occurrens Olavus cum gaudio, et lætus de adventu ejus, utpote filii sororis suæ, jussit magnum convivium præparari. Reginandus vero dixit ad Olavum: „non „communicabo tecum, frater, donec ab illiciti matrimonii vinculo „canonice catholica te solvat ecclesia;“ et addidit: „an ignoras „quia consobrinam mulieris, quam nunc habes uxorem, ante ha„buisti?„ Nec abnuit Olavus, quod verum fuerat, et consobrinam ejus se multo tempore concubinam habuisse testatus est. Congregata igitur synodo, Reginaldus episcopus Olavum Godredi filium et Lauon uxorem suam canonice separavit. Post hæc Olavus Scristinam(!) filiam Ferkkar Comitis de Ros duxit in matrimonium.

Dolens autem uxor Reginaldi regis, regina Insularum, tunc temporis super disjunctione sororis suæ et Olavi, et mota felle amaritudinis, totius quoque discordiæ seminatrix inter Reginaldum et Olavum, misit literas latenter sub nomine Reginaldi regis ad Godredum filium suum ad insulum Ski, ut Olavum comprehenderet et occideret. Godredus mox, auditis litteris, collegit exercitum, et revera perversam matris peracturus voluntatem, si posset, venit ad Lodhus. Olavus vero cum paucis viris ascendens scapham modicam, et vix fugiens a facie Godredi, venit ad socerum suum Comitem de Ros. Godredus autem, tota fere destructa insula et occisis quibusdam hominibus, redit ad propria.

Eo tempore Vice-Comes de Ski vir strenuus et potens in omni regno insularum Pol filius Boke fugit a facie Godredi, eo quod neci Olavi consentire noluit, et habitavit cum comite de Ros una cum Olavo. Paucis transactis diebus Olavus et prædictus Vicecomes amicitiæ foedus inierunt, mediante utriusque juramento, et venerunt pariter cum una navi ad Ski et occultaverunt se in abditis locis aliquantis diebus. Denique missis exploratoribus didicerunt, quod Godredus in quadam insula, quæ vocabatur insula sancti Columbæ, secure cum paucis hominibus moraretur. Et coadunantes sibi omnes amicos et notos suos, et eos qui se sponte sibi jungere voluerunt, intempestæ noctis silentio tractis quinque navibus de proximo maris litore, quod ad duorum stadiorum spatium distabat a prædicta insula, insulam circumdederunt. Godredus autem et qui cum ipso fuerant surgentes primo diluculo et videntes se undique circumceptos(!) ab hostibus obstupuerunt. Sed armis induti bellicis viriter resistere conati sunt, sed frustra, nam circa horam diei nonam Olavus et Pol prædictus Vicecomes cum omni suo exercitu, insulam ingressi sunt; et occisis omnibus, quos extra cepta(!) ecclesiæ repererunt, Godredum comprehensum oculis et genitalibus privaverunt. Quo(!) tamen facto Olavus non concessit, nec resistere potuit propter filium Boke prædictum Vicecomitem. Factum est hoc anno gratiæ m^{o}cc^{o}xx^{o}iij^{o}.

In proxima æstate, acceptis obsidibus ab universis magnatibus insularum, Olavus cum classe triginta duarum navium venit ad Manniam, applicuitque apud Rognalswaht. Ipso tempore Reginaldus et Olavus diviserunt inter se regnum insularum, data Mannia Reginaldo super portione sua cum regali nomine. Olavus vero acceptis cibariis ab populo Manniæ, cum comitatu suo ad portionem suam insularum rediit. Sequenti anno Reginaldus, assumpto secum Alano domino Galwediæ, cum Mannensibus ad insulanas partes profectus est, ut partem terræ quam dederat Olavo fratri suo auferret ab eo, et eam iterum suo dominio subjugaret. Sed quia Mannensibus contra Olavum vel insulanos pugnare non libuit, eo quod diligerent eos, Reginaldus et Alanus Dominus Galwediæ nihil perficientes ad propria reversi sunt.

Post modicum temporis Reginaldus sub occasione eundi ad curiam Domini Regis Angliæ accepit a populo Manniæ centum marchas et profectus est ad curiam Alani domini Galwediæ. Eodem tempore dedit filiam suam filio Alani in matrimonium. Quod audientes Mannenses indignati sunt valde, et mittentes propter Olavum constituerunt eum sibi Regem.

Anno gratiæ m°cc°xx°vi°. Recuperavit Olavus hæreditatem suam, regnum videlicet Manniæ et insularum, quod Reginaldus frater ejus gubernaverat per .xxx^ta. et .viij. annos, et regnavit securè duobus annis.

Anno m°cc°xx°viij.^vo. Olavus cum omnibus optimatibus Manniæ et fortiori parte populi transfretavit ad insulas. Paulo post Alanus dominus Galwediæ et Thomas Comes Etholice,(!) et Reginaldus rex venerunt ad Manniam cum magno exercitu, et totam australem partem Manniæ vastaverunt, et ecclesias spoliaverunt, et viros quotquot capere poterant occiderunt, et redacta est australis pars Manniæ fere in solitudinem. Et post hæc reversus est Alanus cum exercitu suo in terram suam, et reliquit balivos suos in Mannia, qui redderent ei tributa patriæ. Supervenit autem Olavus rex et fugavit eos, et recepit regnum suum. Et coeperunt Mannenses, qui antea circumquaque dispersi fuerant, congregari et confidenter habitare.

Eodem anno inopinate, media nocte, hyemali tempore, venit Reginaldus rex de Galwedia cum quinque navibus, et in eadem nocte combussit omnes naves Olavi fratris sui et omnium optimatum Manniæ apud insulam Sancti Patricii, et circumiens terram pacemque petens a fratre suo mansit apud portum qui dicitur Rognalswath fere .xl. diebus. Interim vero adtraxit animos omnium Insulanorum, qui erant in australi parte Manniæ, ad se, et associabat eos sibi. Quidam autem eorum juraverunt ei se animas suas in mortem posituros pro ipso, donec dimidium regnum insularum sortiretur. E contra Olavus rex omnes aquilonares Manniæ adunavit ad se et in tantum eis loquens prævaluit, quod conglutinata est anima eorum cum ipso; factumque est in quarta decima die mensis Februarii, in festo scilicet Sancti Valentini martyris. Venit Olavus rex ad locum qui dicitur Tyng-

valla cum populo suo et ibi paululum exspectabat. Appropinquante autem Reginaldo fratre ejus ad locum, et populum per turmas disponente, ut cum fratre dimicaret, accessit Olavus cum suis obviam eis; et subito irruens in eos fugavit eos quasi oves, et venientes viri impii ad regem Reginaldum interfecerunt eum in eodem loco, nesciente tamen fratre ejus; quod cum audisset graviter tulit, nunquam tamen in vita sua vindictam sumpsit de morte ejus. Et multis ibidem interfectis venientes prædones ad australem partem Manniæ vastaverunt eam, et fere absque habitatore reliquerunt. Monachi autem de Russin transtulerunt corpus Reginaldi regis ad Abbatiam Sanctæ Mariæ de Furnes, ibique sepultus est in loco quem sibi vivens elegerat.

Post hæc Olavus adiit curiam regis Norvegiæ, sed antequam illuc perveniret, Hacho rex Norvegiæ virum quendam nobilem de regali genere nomine Husbac filium Owmundi regem super Soderenses insulas constituit, vocavitque nomen ejus Haconem. Venit autem idem Haco cum Olavo et Ghotdredo(!) Don filio Reginaldi, et cum multo comitatu Norwegiensium ad Soderenses insulas. Cumque venissent ad Insulam, quæ vocatur Both, et castellum, quod in ea est, expugnare voluissent, prædictus Haco ictu lapidis percussus interiit, sepultusque est in Iona insula.

Anno domini m°cc°xxx°. Venit Olavus cum Gotdredo Don et Norwegiensibus ad Manniam, diviseruntque inter se regnum[1] Manniæ et Insularum, scilicet Olavus et Gotdredus. Olavus Manniam obtinuit; Godredus vero ad insulanas partes profectus in insula quæ vocatur Lodws occisus est. Quo mortuo, Olavus regnum Manniæ et Insularum usque ad obitum . . . . .

Anno m°cc°xxx°vij°., xij°. kal. Junii obiit Olavus Godredi filius rex Manniæ et Insularum apud Insulam Sancti Patricii, sepultusque est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Undecim annis regnavit Olavus in Mannia, duobus annis regnavit vivente Reginaldo fratre suo, et .ix. annis post mortem ejus regnum obtinuit. Quo mortuo, coepit Haraldus filius ejus regnare pro eo. Quatuordecim annorum erat Haraldus cum regnare coepisset,

[1]) Quæ hic sequuntur usque ad „obitum“ non in ipso textu sed in inferiori margine scripta sunt.

et .xii. annis regnavit. In ipsa igitur æstate qua regnare coepit in Mannia ad insulanas partes cum omnibus optimatibus suis transfretavit, constituitque Loglennum quendam de consanguineis suis custodem Manniæ, donec rediret de insulis, veniensque ad insulas gaudenter et honorifice ab insulanis susceptus est. In sequenti auptumpno(!) misit Haraldus tres filios Nel, Dufgaldum, Thorquellum, Molmore, et quendam amicum suum, Joseph nomine, ad Manniam, et applicuerunt apud insulam Sancti Patricii. Facta est igitur in vicesima quinta die mensis Octobris, quæ fuit tertia dies adventus filiorum Nel ad Manniam, congregatio totius Mannensis populi apud Tinguualla, ad quam congregationem venerunt tres filii Nel cum omnibus viris, quos secum de insulanis partibus adduxerant. Venit et prædictus Loglennus custos Manniæ cum omnibus amicis suis et universis, quos ipsa die sibi associare potuerat, ad locum concionis, timebant enim filios Nel eo quod inimicitiæ essent inter eos. In ipsa igitur concione, cum diu in alterutrum inimicitiæ verba jactarent, et acri verborum certamine litigarent, nullatenus ad concordiam flecti possent, de conventu populi exilierunt, et in alterutrum hostiliter irruerunt; prævaluerunt quoque viri, qui cum Loglenno fuerant, et occiderunt in eodem loco duos filios Nel, Dufgaldum et Mormore(!), et prædictum Joseph amicum Haraldi regis; ceteri vero fugerunt. Quo facto, concio populi dissoluta est, et unusquisque in domum suam reversus est. In sequenti vernali tempore venit Haraldus de insulanis partibus ad Manniam, applicuitque apud portum qui dicitur Rognalwac(!). Eodem die Loglennus cum omnibus suis a facie Haraldi fugiens, ad partes Valliæ navigaverat; tulitque secum Godredum Holavi(!) filium alumpnum suum, puerum bonæ indolis. Peracta igitur ipsa die navigando, et ampliori parte noctis, finibus Valliæ appropinquabant. Cumque voluntatis suæ portum cuperent introire, subito factus est illis ventus contrarius; et orta tempestate valida a desiderato portu repulsi sunt, et in eisdem finibus, in quodam scopuloso loco, naufragium pertulerunt. Loglennus igitur cum fere primus terram ascenderet, et Godredum alumpnum suum clamantem post tergum exaudisset, resiluit in navem, volens dare animam

suam pro puero. Cumque puerum amplexaretur, et summo conamine eum ad aridam vellet deducere, a superioribus tabulis navis ad inferiora delapsi ambo pariter submersi sunt. Erat enim navis tota usque ad superiores tabulas impleta fluctibus; ita ut non tam navis inter undas, quam undæ jam intra navem esse viderentur. Submersi sunt cum eis alii circiter xl.ta viri, vix totidem liberatis.

Anno m°cc°xxx°viij°. Gospatricius et Gillescrist(!) filius Murkerthac, missi a rege Norwegiæ, venerunt ad Manniam, et expulso Haraldo a regno Manniæ, eo quod curiam regis Norwegiæ adire recusavit, totius patriæ principatum obtinuerunt, tributa regalia ad opus regis Norwegiæ capientes. Venit igitur semel et iterum Haraldus ad Manniam, et obsistentibus ei in littore prædictis principibus Gospatricio et Gillescrist cum exercitu suo, nec terram ascendere permissus est, nec quicquam ei necessarium concessum est ministrari. Rediensque ad Insulas ibidem moratus est.

Anno m°cc°xxx°ix°. Haraldus, sano et utili accepto consilio, adiit curiam domini regis Norwegiæ et ibidem duobus annis et amplius morabatur; peracto igitur tanto tempore apud regem Norvegiæ invenit tandem gratiam in conspectu ejus, et constituit eum regem super omnes insulas, quas Godredus, Reginaldus, et Olavus antecessores ejus possidebant, et eas sub sigilli sui munimine ei et successoribus, suis hæredibus, in perpetuum confirmavit.

Anno m°cc°xl°. Obiit Gospatricius apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis sepultusque in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno m°cc°x°lij°. Haraldus Olavi filius, confirmato sibi regno Manniæ et Insularum a domino rege Norvegiæ, rediit de Norvegia ad insulanas partes, ubi collecta navium multitudine venit ad Manniam cum magno exercitu; et applicuit apud insulam Sancti Patricii, venitque universus populus Manniæ obviam illi in pace, et eum cum magno gaudio susceperunt. Videns autem Haraldus quod eum tam benigne Mannenses susceperunt, omnes quos secum de insulis adduxerat, datis illis cibariis, remisit ad propria, coepit quoque ex isto tempore quiete et paci-

fice regnare in Mannia, habuitque pacem firmissimam cum rege Angliæ et rege Scotiæ, et confoederatus est illis in amicitia.

Anno m°cc°xl°vij°. Haraldus miles factus est a Domino Henrico rege Angliæ, a quo et pater ejus; et cum multo honore et magnis muneribus ab eo dimissus, venit ad propria.

Eodem anno misit rex Norwegiæ propter Haraldum, ut ejus curiam adveniret. Qui statim tempore autumpnali iter arripiens per Angliam venit Norvegiam, et honorifice suscepit eum Dominus rex Norvegiæ, deditque ei filiam suam in matrimonium; et addidit ut magnificaret eum et exaltaret thronum regni ejus super omnes qui ante eum regnabant in partibus insulanis.

Eodem anno obiit beatæ memoriæ Symon Soderensis episcopus pridie kal. Martii apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis Archangeli, sepultusque est in insula Sancti Patricii in ecclesia scilicet Iermani (!) quam ipse ædificare ceperat. Mortuus est autem anno pontificatus sui octavodecimo in senectute bona. Quo mortuo communi consilio et assensu totius Mannensis Capituli Laurentius quidam, qui tunc Archidiaconus fuit in Mannia, in Episcopum electus est. Qui statim ad Norwegiam profectus est, ut se Haraldo regi et Nidrosiensi Archiepiscopo, a quo consecrari debuerat, præsentaret. Sed Haraldus, propter quasdam literas, quæ contra illum de Mannia transmissæ fuerant, nullatenus electioni ejus assensum præbere voluit, donec iterum cum eo rediret ad Manniam, et ipso præsente ab omni clero et populo eligeretur.

Anno m°cc°xl°ix°. Haraldus Olavi filius rex Manniæ et Insularum cum uxore sua filia regis Norvegiæ et cum prædicto Laurentio electo Manniæ et Insularum, et cum multis aliis nobilibus viris, venit de Norvegia circa festum Sancti Michaelis Archangeli, redire volens ad propria; cumque venisset prope fines Iadlandie, exorta tempestate valida, naufragium pertulit, et cum omni comitatu suo submersus est; cujus interitus causa doloris extitit omnibus qui noverant eum. Cui successit Reginaldus frater ejus in regnum.

Anno m°cc°xl°ix°. Coepit Reginaldus Olavi filius regnare in Mannia pridie nonas Maji; et tricesima die mensis ejusdem,

tertio videlicet kal. Junii, occisus est ab Yuaro milite, et a suis, in prato quodam prope ecclesiam Sanctæ Trinitatis in Russin ad australem partem ejusdem ecclesiæ, sepultusque est in ecclesia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Quo mortuo, Haraldus filius Godredi Don cepit regnare in Mannia.

Eodem tempore Alexander rex Scotiæ coadunavit navium multitudinem copiosam, subjicere sibi volens regnum omnium insularum; cumque pervenisset ad insulam, quæ vocatur Kerwaray, ibi febre correptus mortuus est. Cujus corpus ad monasterium Melrosense translatum, ubi honorifice traditum est sepulturæ. Coepitque Alexander filius ejus, cum adhuc puer esset, regnare pro eo.

Haraldus igitur filius Godredi Don nomen regis et dignitatem sibi usurpans in Mannia, omnes fere principes Haraldi regis Olavi filii exules fecit; et profugos ejus principes et optimates pro eis constituit.

Miraculum de Sancta Maria.

Fuit quidam Princeps Dofnaldus nomine vir grandævus et nobilis, qui præ ceteris specialis exstitit Haraldo Olavi filio. Hic igitur insecutionem Haraldi filii Godredi Don fugiens, venit cum filio suo puerulo ad monasterium Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Venit et prædictus Haraldus post eum ad monasterium; et quia vim ei in loco sancto inferre non potuit, blandis ac deceptoriis verbis eum allocutus est dicens: „Ut quid sic fugere voluisti? Nihil mali tibi inferre cogito," et mediante juramento promisit ei securitatem, et ut libere quocunque vellet iret per patriam persuasit. Credidit homo juramento regis et fidei, et secutus est eum de monasterio. Post modicum temporis rex iniquo usus consilio sui et juramenti oblitus et fidei, prædictum hominem comprehendi fecit et vinciri, ac vinctum duci in insulam quandam, quæ sita est in bosco de Mirescohc, deputatis ei multis custodibus. Erat igitur prædictus princeps fiduciam magnam habens in Domino. Quotiens vero opportune potuit, genua flectebat Domino ut eum intercessione beatæ Mariæ virginis matris ejus, de cujus monasterio fraudulenter ereptus fuerat, a vinculis liberaret. Nec defuit ei divinum auxilium. Quadam nempe die,

cum sederet in domo cum duobus solis hominibus, ceteris egressis ad negotia sua, subito catena de pede ejus cecidit, et liberam ei fugiendi tribuit facultatem, sed cogitans secum, quod expeditius in nocte dormientibus custodibus fugere potuisset, in catenam pedem reponere cogitabat, sed minime potuit. Perpendens igitur quod hoc divino nutu gestum esset, strinxit se tunica et chlamyde, et foras exiliens fugam petiit. Videns alter eum custodum, qui pistoris gerebat officium, surrexit subito et secutus est eum; cumque paululum processisset, cupiens comprehendere fugientem, cecidit super quendam truncum ligni, et semifracto crure, qui paulo ante currere conabatur, manifesta dei virtute nunc stare non potuit. Homo autem per dei gratiam liberatus venit tertia die ad monasterium Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin, gratias agens deo et misericordissimæ matri ejus pro liberatione sua. Hæc sicut ab ore ejus didicimus, scripsimus.

Anno m°cc°l°. Haraldus filius Godredi Don vocatus per literas adiit curiam domini regis Norwegiæ, iratusque est ei rex eo quod regnum sibi non debitum usurparet arripere, detinuitque eum in Norwegia; in proposito habens, ut ei ad Soderenses partes ultra redire non permitteret. Eodem anno Magnus Olavi filius et Johannes filius Dugaldi et quidam Norvegienses venerunt ad Manniam, applicueruntque apud portum, qui dicitur Rognalswaht; misitque Johannes filius Dugaldi nuntios ad populum Manniæ, qui dicebant: „Hæc et hæc mandat vobis Johannes „rex insularum.„ Quod cum audissent Mannenses, Johannem regem insularum nominari, et non Magnum, filium Olavi, indignati sunt valde; et ultra verba nuntiorum audire noluerunt. Reversi nuntii indicaverunt hæc domino suo Johanni, qui statim, indignatus non modice, fecit omnem suum armari exercitum, et armatum insulam Sancti Michaelis ascendere, dispositumque per turmas seriatim sedere fecerat, quasi mox profecturi essent ad prælium, jussitque omnibus ut subsequentis diei primo diluculo parati forent congredi cum Mannensibus, nisi quicquid ab eis petierint ultro spoponderint se daturos. Mannenses igitur contra se directas cernentes acies, audaciter ad littus accesserant; et se e contra per turmas disponentes eventum rei viriliter exspecta-

bant. Recedente autem maris rheumate, quo insulæ aditus claudebatur, prædictus Johannes et qui cum ipso fuerant navibus suis recepti sunt, multis tamen adhuc per insulam evagantibus, aliis vero quæ victui necessaria fuerant præparantibus. Advesperascente autem die, ecce quidam juvenis, qui Yuarum militem comitabatur, cum multis de populo Insularum ingressi sunt et quosdam in ipso impetu homines occiderunt. Multi vero ad naves fugientes enatando submersi sunt. Hoc eis evenisse non ambigo merito superbiæ et magnanimitatis suæ, quia oblatam sibi pacem a populo terræ recusabant accipere. Mandavit enim eis populus Manniæ prima hora diei per internuntios dicens: „Quotquot a latere Domini regis Norwegiæ missi estis literas „ejus nobis ostendentes terram securi ascendite, et quicquid no„bis a sua clementia mandatum fuerit libenti animo faciemus.“ Sed ipsi nec literas ostenderunt, nec responsum pacis dederunt, nec quicquam, quod iis a populo terræ oblatum fuerat, recipere voluerunt; crastina autem die cum indignatione magna de Mannia recedentes multos nobiles exorta tempestate naufragio perdiderunt.

Anno m°cc°l°ij°. Venit iterum Magnus filius Olavi ad Manniam, et susceperunt eum omnes Mannenses cum gaudio regemque sibi constituerunt.

Anno m°cc°l°iij°. Magnus Olavi filius profectus est ad curiam domini regis Norwegiæ et honorifice susceptus est ab eo, mansitque apud eum uno anno.

Anno m°cc°l°iv°. Haco rex Norvegiæ constituit Magnum filium Olavi regem super omnes insulas, quas antecessores ejus jure hæreditario possidebant, et eas ei et successoribus suis hæredibus, ut melius Haraldo fratri ejus, sigilli sui munimine in perpetuum confirmavit. Audiebant et videbant hæc adversarii ejus, et consternati animo contabescebant pereunte spe illorum. Magnus igitur rex Manniæ et Insularum constitutus a domino rege Norvegiæ cum magno honore dimissus venit ad propria.

Anno m°cc°l°vi°. Magnus rex Manniæ et Insularum adiit curiam domini regis Angliæ, quem dominus rex Angliæ gra-

tanter et honorifice susceptum militem fecit, et cum multo honore ac preciosis muneribus dimisit ad propria.

Anno m°cc°lvij°. .Dedicata est ecclesia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin a venerabili domino ac patre Ricardo, Soderensi Episcopo, anno pontificatus ejus quinto, præsente Domino Magno rege Manniæ et Insularum anno regni ejus quinto, Abbate autem domino Symone.

[1]Anno domini m°cc°lx°iij°. Venit Haco rex Norwegiæ ad partes Scotiæ, et nihil expediens reversus est ad Orcades, et ibidem apud Kyrkewa mortuus, et sequenti vernali tempore delatus est in Norvegiam, et sepultus est in ecclesia Sanctæ Trinitatis apud Bergam.

Anno domini m°cc°l°xv°. .viii kal. Decembris obiit Magnus, filius Olavi regis Manniæ et Insularum, apud Castellum de Russyn, et sepultus est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno m°cc°lx°vi. Translatum est regnum Manniæ et Insularum ad Alexandrum regem Scottorum.

Anno m°cc°lxx°iiij. Coronatus est Edwardus rex Angliæ apud Londoniam. Eodem anno celebratum est consilium generale apud Lugdunum sub Gregorio decimo. Eodem anno obiit Margareta regina Scottiæ, filia Henrichi regis Angliæ, soror Edwardi regis. Jacet apud Dunfermeri(!).

[2]Anno domini m°cc°l° xxv°. Septima die mensis Octobris applicuit navigium Domini Alexandri regis Scottiæ apud Rognalwath; et sequenti die, ante solis ortum, commissum est prælium inter Mannenses et Scottos; et Scotti victores existentes occiderunt de Mannensibus in illo conflictu quingentos et triginta septem viros, unde quidam versificator:

L. decies .x. ter, et penta duo cecidere,
Mannica gens de te dampna futura cave.

Anno domini m°ccc°xiii°. Dominus Robertus rex Scotiæ applicuit apud Ramsa videlicet xviij° die Maji, cum multitudine navium; et die dominica sequenti transivit ad Moniales de Duf-

[1] Hic alia manus ac ea, quæ anteriora scripsit, in Ms. incipit. [2] Hic iterum alia manus incipit, literis cursivis.

glas, ubi pernoctavit; et die Lunæ sequenti fecit obsessionem circa castrum de Russyn, quod castrum dominus Dungalli(!) Mac Dowyl tenuit contra prædictum Dominum regem usque diem Martis proximam post festum Sancti Barnabæ apostoli, et ipsa die dictus Dominus rex dictum castellum recepit.

[1]Anno domini m°ccc°xvi°. Die ascensionis Dominicæ mane ad ortum solis Ricardus le Mandevile et fratres ejus cum aliis magnatibus et malefactoribus de Hybernia applicuerunt ad portum de Ranaldwath cum navium multitudine; et exercitum ad terram imposuerunt cum armis et vexillis et magno apparatu et terram petierunt vel sibi ministrari subsidium de victualibus, animalibus et argento, quia deprædati erant per hostes super eos continue debellantes. Sub hac forma ad terræ communitatem nuntios miserunt talia petentes. At communitas respondit se eisdem nihil velle dare sed eis in campo obviare debellando. Hi vero qui erant ab Hybernicis revertentes retulerunt qualiter Mannenses responderunt. Tunc irati Hybernici cantum subito cecinerunt, et confestim paraverunt se ad prælium, et fecerunt sibi duas turmas processeruntque erga Mannenses quousque venerunt sub latere montis de Warchfel(!) in campo ubi quidam manebat nomine Johannes Mandevil, et ibi adinvicem obviaverunt et commissum est bellum. In prima vero aggressione adinvicem terga verterunt Mannenses, et ceciderunt in illo conflictu fere .xl. viri. Et Hybernici persecuti sunt eos in pedibus et in equis, et occiderunt et vulneraverunt magnam multitudinem, et spoliaverunt terram de melioribus bonis omnibus, et argentum multum diu absconditum in pluribus locis pace invenerunt. Post hæc venerunt ad Abbatiam de Russyn, et eam spoliaverunt tam de supellectilibus quam de bobus et ovibus, nihil omnino relinquentes; et cum taliter per mensem perendinassent, impleverunt naves suas de melioribus rebus terræ, et ad propria sunt reversi.

Hi fuerunt Episcopi qui episcopalem cathedram in Mannia susceperunt a tempore Godredi Crouan et aliquanto tempore ante.

Primus exstitit antequam Godredus Crouan regnare coepisset Roolwer Episcopus qui jacet apud ecclesiam Sancti Machuti. Multi

[1] Iterum alia manus incipit.

quidem a tempore beati Patricii, qui primus fidem catholicam prædicasse fertur Mannensibus, exstiterunt episcopi, sed ab ipso sufficit episcoporum memoriam inchoasse. Sufficit, dicimus, quod qui vel quales ante ipsum episcopi exstiterunt penitus ignoramus, quia nec scriptum invenimus, nec certa relatione seniorum didicimus.

Post Roolwer exstitit Willelmus Episcopus.

Post Willelmum in diebus Godredi Crouan Hamondus filius Iole Mannicus genere episcopalem suscepit cathedram.

Huic successit in episcopatum Gamaliel Anglicus genere qui jacet apud Petarborch in Anglia.

Post hunc Ragnaldus Norwegiensis genere Mannensem ecclesiam gubernandam suscepit. Huic primo tertiæ ecclesiarum Manniæ a personis concessæ fuerunt, ut deinceps liberi ab omni episcopali exactione fore potuissent.

Huic successit in episcopatum Cristinus Archadiensis genere qui jacet in Benchorensi monasterio.

Post hunc Michael Mannensis genere vir vitæ venerabilis, et clarus mitis monachus quidem actu et habitu, pontificatum susceperat; et hic ultimum vitæ diem in bona senectute finiens apud Fontanas honorifice jacet.

Huic successit Nicolaus Erchadiensis genere qui jacet in monasterio Bencorensi.

Post hunc Reginaldus vir nobilis de regali genere consecratus episcopus, strenue gubernabat ecclesiam, qui et diuturna infirmitate fatigatus sed in languore continuo non deficiens, sed gratias agens Deo ultimum in confessione bona exhalavit spiritum, sepultusque est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Huic successit Johannes filius Hefare in Episcopatum qui per quoddam miserabile ignis infortunium et per incuriam servientium suorum vitam finiens jacet apud Jerewos in Anglia.

Post hunc Symon Erchadiensis genere vir magnæ discretionis et in sacris scripturis peritus Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam; et hic apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis in senectute bona defunctus, et jacet in ecclesia Sancti Germani quam ipse ædificare coeperat, post cujus obitum vacabat episcopatus ferme sex annis.

[1] Post Symonem vero venerabilem Sodorensem episcopum Ricardus genere Anglicus Romæ ab Archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi consecratus Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam per viginti tres annos. Et hic veniens a generali concilio a. d. mcclxxiiij. obiit apud Langalyver in Coplandia sepultusque est in monasterio Sanctæ Mariæ de Furness.

Post hunc Marcus genere Galuadiensis Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam per viginti quatuor annos nobilissime. [2]Exulatus tum erat per Mannenses ob quam causam interdicta erat terra per tres annos. Postea autem rediit revocatus, et pro relaxatione dictæ sententiæ dederunt de qualibet domo fumigante unum denarium, quod tamen donarium adhuc redditur antiqua ex consvetudine cuilibet antistiti succedenti redeunti de insulis. Prædictus autem Marcus dapsilis et urbanus in senectute bona obiit; cæcus erat ac sepultus in ecclesia Sancti Germani in insula de Holm.

[3]Post hunc Alanus genere Galvediensis Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam honorifice, qui obiit .xv. die mensis Februarii a. d. mcccxx. et sepultus est in ecclesia beatæ Mariæ de Rothersay in Buth.

Cui successit Gillebertus Mac Lelan Galvediensis genere. Episcopus fuit Sodorensis per duos annos et dimidium et sepultus in ecclesia prædicta de Both.

Postea successit Bernardus natione Scotus et sepultus est in monasterio de Kilwynyn in Scotia. Vixit in episcopatu quatuor annis.

Huic successit Thomas genere Scotus. Vixit in episcopatu octodecim annos et sepultus est in Scona in Scotia; obiit autem vigesimo die mensis Septembris a. d. mcccxlviii.

[4]Hic primus viginti solidos nomine procurationum de ecclesiis Manniæ extorsit.

Hic fuit primus qui decimas omnium alienorum de piscatura alecum rectoribus extorsit insulæ prælibatæ.

Anno domini .mcccxlviij. Wilhelmus Russell natione Man-

[1] Incipit alia manus. [2] Incipit alia manus. [3] Incipit etiam alia manus. [4] Incipit manus alia recentior.

nicus Abbas monasterii Sanctæ Mariæ de Russyn electus est per clerum insulæ Manniæ in pastorem ecclesiæ Sodorensis in ecclesia cathedrali Sancti Germani in Mannia in Holmo et consecratus est Avinione a Clemente Papa .vi[to]., atque primus electus Sodorensis ecclesiæ fuit consecratus per sedem apostolicam et confirmatus; nam omnes sui antecessores ab archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi videlicet metropolitano confirmari et consecrari assueverunt.

Obiit autem vigesimo primo die mensis Aprilis .mccclxxiv. apud Ramsheved et sepultus est in monasterio Sanctæ Mariæ de Furness, qui quidem fuit Abbas de Russyn .xviij. annis et vixit episcopus Sodorensis .xxvi. annis.

Pridie mensis Junii die Jovis, festo videlicet corporis Christi, in ecclesia cathedrali Sancti Germani in Mannia a. d. mccclxxiv. Johannes Donkan Mannensis quidam per clerum Manniæ est electus in pastorem et episcopum Sodorensem. Et in festo scilicet Sancti Leonardi proximo sequenti est Avenione per papam Gregorium .xi. confirmatus; et in festo Sanctæ Catherinæ proximo sequenti apud fratres prædicatores per Cardinalem Prænestinum dudum Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem[1] est solemniter cum aliis octo Episcopis consecratus. In festo autem conversionis Sancti Pauli a. d. .mccclxxvi. et suæ consecrationis tertio, in dicta sua ecclesia cathedrali fuit solempniter installatus, maximis oblationibus dicto die in sua prima missa pontificali acquisitis, nam interim fuit apud Boloniam in [Pic]ardia strictis carcere et vinculis f . . . captus sed postea .d. marchis redemptus. . . . . .

[1] Sic emendatum, in codice ipso prave: Carocuviacum.

Notes.

Pag. 1—2.

Anno ab incarnatione domini m. . . . . Anno $m^{o}xx^{o}ij^{o}$. All these entries are entirely taken from the *Chronica de Mailros*, as stated in the preface, only every number of years p. Chr. is less by 17 than that originally entered in the Chronica. What may have been the cause of this alteration is very difficult to guess, especially as even the writer himself does not keep up the same difference throughout the whole time. In the next entry there is a difference from the right number of 19 years, which difference is kept up until A. D. 1093 (1073), where a new difference of 20 years begins, and lasts until 1102. From this year to the end we generally find the right number. For these reasons it is obvious that the writer cannot have adopted any peculiar era; it would seem that he has only committed some blunders in reading the ciphers used to indicate the dates in the text he followed.

Pag. 3.

The real *Chronicles of Man*, or the entries belonging to the history of this kingdom only, commence with the year 1066 (1047). The first lines touching the death af King Edward the Confessor, are still due to the Chronica de Mailros, the rest, however, is original. Here, therefore, Camden has also commenced his abridgment. The first King of Man here mentioned, viz. Godred Son of Sytric, is not, however, the first known in history, but it was not the author's plan to carry the history farther up than to Godred Crowan, whom he probably supposed the founder of the reigning dynasty. Perhaps he did not even know of any King of Man previous to Godred the Son of Sigtrygg, although the Icelandic family-sagas, as

well as the Irish annals, speak of Kings either in Man or in the Isles for more than a century earlier than the two Godreds here mentioned.

The great Norwegian invasion which lasted from the end of the 8th to the middle of the 9th century, and caused the erection of Norwegian kingdoms in Ireland, comprised also the islands between Ireland and Scotland, and these were even more completely subdued and subjected to the Norwegian rule, than any part of Ireland itself. Indeed, the island of Man and the southermost islands west of Scotland are to be regarded as the centre of the Norwegian settlements in these parts of Europe. From these islands eminently fitted to serve as a stronghold for these hardy Vikings, whose strength consisted almost entirely in their large and well constructed ships, the tide af invasion flowed to the west, to the north, to the east, and passing through Cumberland and the territory of the Strath-Clyde Britons it even reached to the eastern parts of Britain, where it met with another current from the North, that of the Danes, with which it easily coalesced, although traces are not wanting of their early encounters in a manner far from friendly. Man, as well as the rest of the islands, seems for the first period either to have been subjected to the Norwegian kings of Dublin, or to have been ruled by several Chieftains of Vikings, who did not adopt the title of kings. In 852 Olaf the white, the Amhlabh of the Irish chronicles, descended from the same family as Harold the fair-haired, afterwards King of Norway, conquered Dublin with the adjacent territory, and founded this, the most renowned, most powerful and most lasting Norwegian kingdom in Ireland. Olaf was married to *Aude*, daughter of the mighty and valiant Norwegian baron *Ketil Flatnef* (flat-nose) from Sogn. This Ketil, it is said in some Sagas (as the *Land-náma)*, was sent by King Harold of Norway to chastise some Vikings, who had taken up their abode in the Isles, although previously expelled by the King himself, and having executed his commission, he made himself independent there; according to another and far more probable version of the story (that of the Laxdœlasaga), Ketil emigrated from Norway to the Isles, because he was obnoxious to the king, and could not resist him in his own country. The marriage of his daughter with Olaf of Dublin, which must have taken place about 850, as their son was

grown a man in 870, is sufficient to show, that Ketil, although perhaps still chiefly resident in Norway, must have been a man of great consequence in those parts long before the King himself went there to expel the Vikings; perhaps even he helped Olaf to make his conquests. All the Sagas, in which these events are mentioned, agree that King Harold Hair-fair made himself a great expedition to the Islands near Scotland and Ireland against the Vikings there settled, who continued to infest the seas occasionally even making attacks upon Norway, their mother country, and that, in this expedition, he conquered Shetland (*Hjaltland*), the Orkneys, the Sudreys (Hebudes) and even Man, killing or expelling the Vikings, who were not strong enough to make any serious resistance. From this expedition upwards, which seems to have taken place in the year 870, the later Norwegian kings derived their right or title to these islands, and as even now some stanzas remain of a poem, in which these events were celebrated by the King's chief court-poet, who perhaps accompanied his Master on this expedition, there can be no possible doubt of the thing having really taken place. The colonization of Iceland, beginning about this time, and chiefly being effected by powerful Norwegian families, who did not come directly from Norway, but from the Sudreys, where they had lived for some years after their expatriation, and among whom the very Ketil Flatnef here mentioned occupies a prominent place, makes it almost certain that the immediate reason for the second transmigration of these men with their whole families was no other than King Harold's expedition. And consequently, even that colonization bears a strong evidence as to the truth of the ancient tale.

The Orkneys with Shetland King Harold gave as a hereditary Earldom to Earl Ragnwald (Reginald) of Mœre in Norway, whose son, Turf-Einar, was the founder of the illustrious Orkneyan dynasty, which continued in the unbroken male line for 300 years, when female succession brought the Atholl dynasty in from Scotland in its place, which, again, was followed by the Angus dynasty, and this at last by the family of St. Clair, all subsequent dynasties, however, deriving their right from their relation to the original Norwegian line. The Sudreys including no doubt the Isle of Man, he confided to the care of an Earl, named *Tryggvi*, and, he having been killed, to another Earl named *Asbjörn*

Skerjablesi.[1] It is, however, obvious that the position of these Earls must have been very precarious and dangerous, as they were from Norway, and exposed to incessant attacks from the Vikings. Both of them came also to an untimely death; Tryggvi was first killed, as stated above, then Asbjörn was attacked by two relations of Ketil Flatnef who killed him, captured his wife and daughter, and sold the latter as a slave. There are no traces of King Harold having sent a third Earl to the Islands. Perhaps even the death of Asbiörn Skerjablesi took place when the King was already grown old and not fit for expeditions like the former.

The immediate successors of King Harold did not, as far as we can see, maintain the suzerainity over the remote Sudreys and Man, and it is most probable, that the latter at least formed a part of the dominions of the successors of Olaf the white on the Norwegian throne of Dublin, who were unquestionably now the most powerful rulers on these seas. Olaf's and Aude's Son, Thorstein the Red, even conquered a part of Scotland, as the Landnama tells us. We can, namely, trace the power and influence of these kings beyond the sea to the coasts of Cumberland, and across the country to Northumberland; where the Danes had made extensive conquests, and a branch of the royal Danish line, descended from the great conqueror Ragnar Lodbrok, had established its throne at York.[2] When this branch was extinguished

[1] Landnáma IV. 1. 3. Droplaugarsuna Saga p. 4.

[2] Guðröðr (or *Güðréd)* the son of Hardecnut, king of Denmark and grandson of Lodbrok, was, according to Simeon of Durham and others, elected king of the Danes at York 882, and died 894 (according to Ethelwerd 896, the 25 August); as son of Hardecnut he was the brother of king Gorm in Denmark, who, indeed, seems to have been no other, than the well known Guðrum, who made peace with king Alfred in 878, and was baptized with the name of Athelstan, „Gormr, Gurmr" being a contraction of *Goðormr, Guðurmr.* The Danish historian Saxo speaks (p. 468) of a *Gorm anglicus*, who was first king in England, but went afterwards to Denmark, where he was succeeded by a Harold, and this again by *Gorm the old*, the husband of Thyre Danebot; the annals of Ry monastery (commonly called Chronicon Erici regis) say even, that Gorm anglicus was christened in England (Langebek Scriptt. R. D. I. p. 158). All ancient Sagas do not know of more than one Gorm, viz. Gormr hinn gamli (the old) son of Hardecnut. But as Hardecnut was the grandson of Ragnar Lodbrok, who died about

about 920, and the subordinate Danish Chieftains had submitted to Edward, son of king Alfred, the kingdom of York was given in fief by the English kings to princes from Dublin, belonging to the royal race of Olaf the white. This, although not expressly stated, is still evident from various reasons. For when Ragnwald (Reginald) probably a son of Guðröðr son of Hardecnut († c. 894) was dead about 924,[1] there appears as his successor a king named Sigtrygg, who, immediately after the accession of Athelstane to the throne, went to him at Tamworth (Jan. 26, 926) made homage to him as his liege vassal, and was married to Athelstane's sister, but died next year, when Athelstane expelled his two sons (as it would seem by a former marriage, or illegitimate) Olaf (Anlaf) and Guðröðr (Gúðred), and made himself master of Northumberland; and the Irish annals show, that in the year of 920, just before the appearance of the Sigtrygg here mentioned at York, Sigtrygg, king of Dublin since 917, was expelled from this place[2]; from this coincidence it is therefore to be inferred, that he went over to Northumberland and profited by the disturbances after the extinction of the royal line, and got possession of this country. Moreover, the name of Sigtrygg, being common and characteristic to the royal line of Dublin but foreign to the Danish line of York, there consequently is no great probability that king Sigtrygg's belonged to it, or, if that were really the case, he must at least have been descended from the Dublin Kings on the maternal side. The well-known ecclesiastical Annalist, Mag. Adam of Bremen, says, it is true, that Gúð-

800, while Gorm the old died 936, having a son, the renowned Harold Bluetooth, who died 986, it is evident, that the men who first wrote down the Sagas must have confounded the two Gorms with each other, and made one of them, thus dropping two links in the line of generations; for it is impossible, that the space of time from 800 till 986 could have been filled with only four generations. Now, as Gudrum Athelstane is said in the Chron. Saxonicum to have died in 891, but in the year 906 a new Guðrum appears, who made with king Edward, Alfred's son, the treaty of Yttingaford (Thorpe's Ancient Laws of England p. 71), and this Guðrum, according to Wallingford, was called from Denmark to England, we have here even the younger Gorm above mentioned.

[1] Chron. Sax. [2] Annals of Ulster, O'Connor Rer. Hib. Ser. III. p. 261.

réd the son of Hardecnut was succeeded by his three sons, Olaf, Sigtrygg and Reginald;[1] but his authority is of no weight, as it is evident, that he has known and used the *Chronicon Saxonicum*, and, in his uncritical way, believed all those kings, who were next mentioned as kings of York, to have been sons of that Gúðréd.

Olaf, the son of Sigtrygg, fled to Ireland, but his brother Gúðréd went to Constantine, king of Scotland, and Eugene, lord of Cumberland, soliciting their assistance. Threatened by emissaries from Athelstane, they dared not comply with the wishes of Guðred, and he was compelled to depend upon his own resources, supported only by a faithful friend, Thurfred; they besieged York, but did not succeed, shortly afterwards they were taken prisoners and confined in a castle; they escaped, and went to sea, but Thurfred was drowned, and Guðréd, having met with many misfortunes, chose to throw himself on the mercy of Athelstane, and repaired to his court, where he indeed got a good reception; but only for four days, could, the old Viking stand this quiet life, and „went back to his ships like a fish to the sea.“[2] It seems, that the battle of *Vinheid*, described at large and very spiritedly in the Egils-Saga, is one of the incidents of the feud here mentioned, (only the Saga-author has probably made a little more of it than it really was) and not, as has been believed, the celebrated battle of Brunanburg, which took place in 938; at least the Egils-Saga itself says distinctly, that the battle of Vinheid was fought shortly after the accession of Athelstane.[3]

Olaf the son of Sigtrygg is not the only king of this name at that time appearing in the English and Irish annals, and making war against Athelstane. There was also another Olaf, son of the cruel Gúðréd, king of Dublin, who left Dublin some time after the death of his father (934), either expelled by his subjects, or allured by the hope of getting possessions in Northumberland;[4] but the annals here are so meagre and obscure, that in many cases it is impossible to see, which of the two is meant; perhaps even the annalists themselves did not know it. One of these Olafs was married to the daughter of Constantine, king of Scotland, and tried to get possession of Northumberland through his help; and although Constantine had made homage to Athelstane, he was seduced

[1] Mag. Adamus I. 41 and II. 22. [2] William of Malmesbury, ed. Savile, p. 50. [3] Egils Saga. Cap. 51—56. [4] Annales Ulton. p. 261.

by Olaf to shake off his allegiance already in 934, which caused Athelstane to make a great expedition against Scotland. In this war Athelstane was successful, and compelled Constantine to submit anew and give his son as a hostage for his future obedience. Few years after, however, Constantine, as the annalists tell, prevailed on his son in law to attack England, and it is to be inferred from the greatness of the armament, as well as from the importance, which the entries in the old annals evidently assign to these events, and lastly from the *Epinicion* composed by the English poets to commemorate the victory of Brunanburgh, (inserted at large in the *Chronicon Saxonicum*), that all the Danish and Norwegian Chiefs in the north of England and south of Scotland, had formed a league to regain their former position in Northumberland, and that they were supported by their brethren from Ireland and the Isles, as well as by Constantine. Certain it is, that the son in law of Constantine had amongst his auxiliaries even his namesake, the other Olaf. With 615 ships he landed in the Humber, accompanied by five Kings besides Constantine, and seven Earls. He was, however, totally defeated by Athelstane in the great battle of *Brunanburh* (938) and the Norwegians, so says the ancient poem, were driven back to Dublin and Ireland.[1] The return to Dublin of Olaf Son of Gúðréd is even mentioned in the Ulster annals;[2] of the other Olaf, however, nothing is heard for the next years, which corroborates the opinion stated above, that it was he, who had married the daughter of Constantine, and therefore did not then go to Ireland, but returned to Scotland, where no annals are left to record his arrival. At the death of Athelstane, the annals proceed to tell us, that the Northumbrians again revolted, and took Olaf from Ireland to their King;[3] and that Olaf was now successful, being supported even by the Archbishop Wulfstán. Both archbishops, Odo of Canterbury and Wulfstán of York negociated a treaty between Olaf and Eadmund, the successor of Athelstane, by which treaty Eadmund ceded to Olaf the ancient Danish kingdom north-east of Wætlingastræt, on condition, that Olaf should embrace Christianity.[4] Olaf was really christened, and Eadmund himself acted as his godfather. Shortly afterwards, Olaf died (943), and Eadmund now, it is said, expelled

[1] Chron. Saxonicum. [2] Annal. Ulton. p. 263. [3] Chron. Sax. [4] Chron. Sax. and Simeon Dunelmensis.

Reginald, the son of Gúðréd, probably the brother of Olaf, who had also been christened, as well as Olaf the son of Sigtrygg (944); which shows, that this person had now returned to Northumberland, and that it was not he, but Olaf of Dublin, who concluded the treaty with Eadmund. Eadmund died in 946, and was succeeded by his brother Eádréd, who went immediately to Northumberland; and received the homage of the Archbishop and the principal Chiefs. Not long time afterwards, however, they rebelled anew, and took *Eric*, the son of Harold, to be their King.[1] It is evident, that this Eric is no other, than Eric Blood-axe, the son of Harold Fairhair, King of Norway, who was expelled from his reign in the Year of 934. He is said by the Norwegian sagas to have addressed himself immediately to King Athelstane, and to have received from him the kingdom of Northumberland, where he reigned peaceably till the accession of King Eadmund, who, it is said, did not like the Norwegians, and intended to give Northumberland to another King, which caused Eric to go away, join some Viking-Kings in Ireland, and in their company to make an attack somewhere on the south of England, where he was killed. The statement of the English annals, as to the events in Northumberland from the reign of Athelstane to the times of King Eádréd, show that the Norwegian account cannot be accurate, and that Eric did not make his appearance in Northumberland till 948, as above stated, and during the reign of Eádréd. Eric, the English annals say, was expelled by the Northumbrians themselves, terrified by the threats of Eádréd; then came *Olaf Cwaran* from Dublin, who seems to be no other person than the Olaf Sigtryggson above mentioned, and was likewise made King and afterwards expelled by the Northumbrians, then Eric again returned, but was killed in a battle on the „Stone-moor" (Stánmór) 950.[2] The particulars of this battle, as given by Matthew of Westminster, bear still more witness as to the identity of this Eric, Harolds son, with Eric Bloodaxe son of the Norwegian Conqueror.[3] Since that time, there were no northern Kings in

[1] Chron. Sax.

[2] Matthæus Westmonast. p. 369. cfr. Hoveden, ed. Savile p. 423, Mon. hist. Brit. I. p. 687. note d.

[3] Also Mag. Adam speaks of Eric, Harold's son, coming to England and being killed there; he calls him Herric or Herring, but he believes him to

Northumberland, but the King gave it as an hereditary Earldom to the heágeréfa Ósulf, by whose treason the death of Eric is said to have been caused.

We have here dwelled at some length upon the history of the kingdom of Northumberland in its connexion with the kingdom of Dublin, because it is evident, that it must somehow, too, be the history of *Man*, this island, forming the intermediate step between Dublin and Cumberland, being also necessarily connected with either of the two. This is still more probable, as, since the downfall of the kingdom of York, we begin to meet with independent Kings of Man or of the Isles, still, however, closely connected with those of Dublin; and among the names of these Kings, we find Godréd (*Guðröðr*), Harold, Sigtrygg, Olaf, all of them belonging to the lines of Kings now mentioned, and showing them almost with a certainty to have been their descendants or near relations. Olaf Cwaran, being expelled from Northumberland for the last time, seems to have had his chief residence for some years either in Man or in the Isles, while from time to time he made expeditions to Ireland waiting for an opportunity to regain some of his former possessions there. In this, at least, he succeeded, being mentioned by the Ulster annals in the year of 969 as lord of Dublin, after which time he continued in the possession of it till — having sustained a terrible defeat by the supreme King of Ireland, Melachlin (Malsechnail), and been compelled to deliver all his captives and hostages, as well as to resign the yearly tribute, which he had hitherto levied from the Nial tribe, and to pay a great contribution of cattle and money — he felt so depressed that he resolved to go to Jona on a pilgrimage, there to do penance for his sins. Perhaps even he abdicated before he went away, meaning to pass the remainder of his life among the holy men; he died, however, in the same year as he came there (980). This resolution of his, after all, shows that there must also have been a connexion of some kind between him and the Isles. About this time, there appears in the ancient annals as Lord of the Isles a King or Chieftain, designed by the odd name of *Maccus Son of Harold*, which, indeed, seems to be nothing more than

have been a son of Harold King of Denmark; it is evident, that even here Mag. Adam has taken his statement from English chronicles, and that the descendence assigned to Eric rests only upon his own conjecture.

a misconstruction of the Irish „*Mac Arailt*," i. e. „the son of Harold," his real name being consequently unknown [1]. This „Mac Harold" conquered Anglesey, from which conquest, however, he was driven shortly afterwards. In the year of 973, he is named among the eight Kings from the whole island of Britain, who then made their homage to King Eâdgâr at Chester, and rowed his barge to and from Church. In the next year, he occupied the fair island of Inniscathaig, situated in the mouth of Shannon, where he robbed the tomb of St. Senan, and delivered from captivity the norwegian King of Limerick, named Ivar. On this expedition, it is said, the „Lagmanns" of the Isles went along with him [2]. Now the word „Lagman" (*lögmaðr*, *lagmaðr*, As. *lahmon*) literally signifies „a man of the law", and afterwards in Norway, as in Sweden, was the title of the Chief judges. Here, however, it is used as the peculiar title of some of the chieftains, and perhaps we may conclude from this, that these chieftains were invested with a special judiciary power. It is worth while here to remark, that afterwards, in the very family of the Insular kings, and most probably of this „Mac Harold" himself, the name „*Lagman*" (*Lögmaðr*) was used as a noun proper, being the name of one King at least, as we shall see below. This may, perhaps, be explained thus, that the natives of the Isles, hearing the title of „lawman" bestowed upon a Chieftain, fancied it to be his real name, and adopted it as such themselves, whence again it found its way as such back to the Norwegian conquerors, who intermarried with the native Families, and, as usual in Norway, often happened to give to one of their sons the name of his maternal grandfather. There is another instance of the same thing, throwing a very interesting light upon this matter. It is well known, that the Norwegian

[1] He is called „Maccus" - - „*plurimarum rex insularum*" by Florence of Worcester, *Monum. hist. Brit.* 1. p. 578. In „*Brut y Tywysogion*" (ib. p. 849) his name is *Marc uab Herald*. The „*Annales Cambriæ*" have only „*filius Haraldi*", even so the Annals of Innisfallen, calling him „*Mac Arailt*", *O'Connor*, *res. hib. Scr.* I. p. 44, 46. The annals of the 4 masters give his name, evidently wrongly „*Maccnus Mac Arailt*"; the name „Magnus", however, did not exist among the Northmen at that time. In an Anglos. diploma of the year 971, appearing, however, not to be genuine, he calls himself „*Mascusius archipirata.*"

[2] Ann. of the 4 masters.

name *Sumarliði* was (and is perhaps still, as corrupted into „Somerled") very frequent among the inhabitants of the Western Isles and Shores of Scotland, while in some of the Irish annals, we find the Norwegian vikings or a peculiar kind of them, called „*Sumarlidi*" („the Somerleds") as if this were a noun appellative, which is rather adequate in itself, for „*Sumarliði*", composed of „*Sumar*" i. e. summer, and *liði* (a person who wanders about, from the verb *liða*, to wander, As. *lidan*) signifies „Summer-Wanderer", a very proper name for a pirate, who went out on his expeditions every summer, spending the winter at home, or in a friendly port. The Norwegians had also and have yet another name parallel to „*Sumarliði*", viz. *Vetrliði*, the first part of which is the word *vetr*, i. e. Winter; literally translated, it means „Winter-Wanderer", and is used as a noun appellative to design a bear, who has gone to take his winter-sleep. It seems very likely that also *Sumarliði* originally has been used in the same manner, to designate the bear, roving about in the summer, and that the skalds or poets have since applied both as proper designations for the Vikings, either wandering about for prey in the summer, or taking to their snug hearths in the winter, but that, as it happened so often in Norway and Iceland, the general denomination became a surname for certain persons, and this surname again in succeeding generations the real and only name of descendants called after them[1].

From this digression, which may not be superfluous for the better understanding of what follows, we return to the „Mac Harold" above mentioned. For three successive years he maintained himself at Inniscathaig, till, in the year 976, he was attacked and killed along with his two sons, by the celebrated *Brian Boroimhe*, whose name now begins to appear in the Irish annals. Ivar of Limerick, who showed his gratitude to „Mac Harold" by assisting him, however in vain, was defeated and put to flight. As King of Man and the Isles there appears now a *Godred* (*Guðröðr*) *Son of Harold*; which patronymical designation makes it very

[1] In this way, we find the great grandson of the powerful Icelandic Chieftain Thord Gellir called only „Gellir", although this was only the nickname of his father, who got it because of his stentorian voice (*Gellir* i. e. the bellowing). Even so Skafte, the „Lögsögumaðr" of Iceland about 1003, was called after his grandmother's father, whose proper name was Thormod, but who had got the surname of *Skafte*.

probable, that he was a brother of the former „Mac Harold". Seeing, that the names of Harold and Godred occur very frequently in the royal line of Limerick, and that Ivar of Limerick was so closely connected with „Mac Harold", we think it very likely, that the royal line of Man was a branch of the same. Godred is frequently mentioned in the Sagas, as well as in the Irish and British annals. In 979, he supported the Welsh Prince Constantine the Black against his cousin Howel, but was twice defeated with considerable loss; the third time, however, he came in the opportune hour, when Meredith, the son of Owen, had obtained the dominion after great struggles. Profiting by the state of exhaustion, in which Meredith found himself, he attacked Anglesey, slaughtered 2000 men, captured the brother of Meredith, and had his eyes put out. The terrified Meredith fled to Cardigan, leaving Godred, it would seem, in the possession of Anglesey. His success, however, was not of long duration, a more powerful star having risen on the western horizon. This was *Sigurd* (Siward), Earl of Orkney and Caithness, son of Earl *Hlöðver* (Lewis) by an Irish princess, and great grandson of the famous Turf-Einar, the third Earl and founder of the dynasty. Sigurd, having succeeded to the Earldom in 980, at his father's demise, aspired, as it seems, to nothing less than the subjugation of all islands, coasts or lands in the West, where the Norwegians had made settlements. Selecting his warriors from different parts of the North, he made every year attacks upon Scotland, the Sudreys, and Ireland, and succeeded, not only in keeping Caithness, which the Maormor of Moray, Finnlaich (the father of the famous Macbeth) strove in vain to take, but ultimately in conquering and possessing for a time Sutherland, Ross, Moray and Argyll.

The Isles or Sudreys proper, which, shortly before his accession, are stated to have paid tribute direct to Norway[1], came very soon un-

[1] In the *Flóamanna Saga*, which appears to be very trustworthy, it is told, that about the year 980 Earl Hácon sent Thorgils, a high-born Icelander who had entered his service, to the Sudreys, with the commission to exact and collect the tribute „which had been withheld for three successive years." Thorgils and his friend, a Norwegian named Thorstein, went away with two ships, but not many people; having reached the Isles, they demanded the tribute, but got only very little of it; on their return, they were shipwrecked on the coast of Caithness, and lost all their goods; yet they were

der his sway, and were governed by a tributary Earl, called *Gilli*[1] in the Sagas, who resided in Colonsay[2], and in 989 married his sister. In 982 Sigurd made a successful attack upon the isle of Man, and extorted from the inhabitants a heavy ransom, to be paid in pure silver, of which, however, only a small part came into his hands, because the collectors, having suffered shipwreck on an uninhabited island near the Irish coast, could not get away otherwise, than by purchasing from an icelandic merchant, coming from Dublin, the boat of his ship for the greater part of the collected silver[3]. That Godred the son of Harold, who pretended to be King of Man and all the Isles, would necessarily sooner or later come into conflict with Sigurd or his vassals, is not surprising. In the year 987, after having fought a successful, but very bloody, battle with a fleet of Danish pirates, who had attacked Jona on Christmass night, and killed the Abbot with 15 monks[4], was himself, in his turn, attacked and vanquished by a little fleet, under the command of Earl Sigurd's men. In 989 he was again vanquished by the same warriors, and lost his son Donald in the battle[5]. Shortly afterwards, before the

hospitably received by an Earl, named Olaf, who commanded in these parts, and Thorgils had the opportunity of serving the Earl a good turn, by killing, in „holmgang" or judiciary combat, a redoubted pirate, who insolently demanded the Earl's sister in marriage. Thorgils, who according to the „holmgang law", inherited the ships and chattels of the Pirate, was rewarded with the hand of the fair damsel, and the Earl's assistance; the next year, therefore, he was able to appear at the Sudreys with greater force, and compel the inhabitants to pay the amount.

[1] This is evidently only the first half of the Earl's real name. We learn from the Norwegian history, that the King Harold Gilli, who was born and bred up in Ireland, did originally bear the name of Gilchrist, Gillachrist, which afterwards in Norway was shortened into *Gilli*; in the same manner, the above named Earl may have in reality been called Gillecolum, Gillepatrick, Gillechrist, or by another of these names, being compositions of „Giolla" (a servant) and some Saint's name.

[2] In the Njála it is called „Koln", and has been believed by others to be *Coll;* it seems however evident that „Kolns-ey" must be „Colonsay".

[3] Eyrbyggjasaga c. 29. Thorodd, the Icelander, was henceforth called „Thorodd Skattkaupandi" (the purchaser of the tribute).

[4] Annals of Ulster.

[5] Njálssaga c. 87.

end of the year, he was killed by the dalriadic Scots, according to the Irish annals [1].

For a long time afterwards Earl Sigurd seems to have been in undisputed possession of the Sudreys, yet, as it is distinctly stated, tributary to the powerful ruler of Norway, Earl Hácon, as long almost as this prince lived. Beyond the annual tribute, however, no other sign or service of vassalage seems to have been enforced, and Sigurd ruled in fact as an independent and powerful monarch. He strengthened himself greatly by marrying a daughter of the Scottish King Malcolm (of the Moray dynasty, nephew of Finnlaich). A little before the death of Earl Hácon, he was unlucky enough, to fall in with King Olaf Tryggvason, in the bay of Ronaldsvoe, when on his way from Dublin, to get the Norwegian crown, who now availed himself of the opportunity — Sigurd being the weaker part — to take the Earl prisoner, and restored him to liberty only on condition, that he swore him fealty as his liege subject, and embraced Christianity with all his men. Olaf, however, did not reign for more than 5 years; after his fall in the battle of Swalder (A. C. 1000), Norway was divided among the victors (the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, and Earl Eric, Son of Earl Hácon), and as there is no mention to be found of Sigurd's having acknowledged the superiority of any of these princes, it is very likely that during this interregnum he ruled as an independent sovereign; his brother in law, the Earl of the Sudreys, continuing on the best terms with him, and, consequently, doubtless paying him tribute every year. The interregnum ended by the accession of Olaf, the son of Harold, afterwards St. Olaf, to the Norwegian crown in 1015, but shortly before that time, Earl Sigurd fell in the great battle of Clontarf near Dublin (on the 23 of April, 1014), against Brian Boroimhe [2]. He left four sons, three begotten before his marriage with the Scottish princess, now full-grown men; the fourth, Thorfinn, grand-son of the Scottish King, still a child. Those three divided Orkney and Shetland between themselves; but no mention is made, on this occasion, of the Sudreys. It may be, that Earl Gille continued in his allegiance even to the sons of Sigurd; it may also be probable, that King Cnut, who claimed

[1] *Tighernac*, by O'Connor, v. II. p. 267. Ulster Annals ib. IV. p. 286.

[2] It is therefore called „the Brians-battle“ in the Sagas.

for himself the right to the Norwegian crown, even tried to enforce the obedience of the Sudreys. It is told in a very old abridgment of the Norwegian history, written about 1180, only 166 years after the death of Earl Sigurd, that when King Olaf, on his arrival in Norway, captured Earl Hácon, son of Eric, nephew of King Cnut, he made him swear, that he would never return to Norway, and gave him the Sudreys, and assisted him to establish his power there[1]. The last is not true, as far as regards Olaf, but it is not unlikely, that King Cnut may have helped Earl Hácon to get possession of the Isles, especially as it is certain, that Earl Hácon, when he made his last fatal voyage to Norway in the winter 1029—30, went down and was drowned in the Pentland firth, which seems to imply, that he did not come from the eastern parts of England, but from the West.

Be this, however, as it may, there can be no doubt, that *Thorfinn*, Earl Sigurd's fourth son, who, like his father, became one of the most powerful princes in those parts, extended also his rule to the Sudreys. The Orkneyinga Saga says so expressly. Outliving his elder brothers, he became the Lord of Orkney and Shetland; Caithness was given him by his maternal grand-father, King Malcolm Mac Malbrigid, and after the death of Malcolm in 1029[2], he sustained a successful war with King Malcolm Mac Kenneth, of the southern dynasty, conquered Sutherland and Ross, and made himself lord of Galloway[3], in the

[1] *Ágrip* cap. 20, Fornmanna Sögur, X. p. 396.

[2] We take it as granted, that the reader is aware of the mistake so common among the historians of Scotland, to confound the two Malcolms here mentioned, and to make one of them, as if one Malcolm only (Malcolm II) reigned from 1004 till 1034. The very trustworthy Tighernach states expressly, that „King Malcolm Mac Malbrigid Mac Ruairi" died in 1029, and „King Malcolm Mac Kenneth" in 1034. They were both heads of the two rival dynasties, who claimed the crown of Scotland, and the representatives of whom for a long period reigned almost alternately; the Croeb or Moray dynasty, and that of Mac Alpin. Even in the Orkney. S. the death of Malcolm, the grandfather of Thorfinn, is said to have taken place between incidents, one of which belongs to A. C. 1028, the other to A. C. 1030.

[3] Orkneyinga Saga p. 54. It is here said that „Earl Thorfinn resided for long periods at Caithness, in the place called *Gaddgedlar*, where England and Scotland touch each other". Considering the situation of Caithness,

widest sense of this denomination, viz. from Solway to Carrick, where he resided for long periods, and whence he made successful inroads, sometimes on Cumberland, the English possession of Duncan, King Malcolm's grandson and future successor, sometimes upon Ireland, of which he is said to have conquered a part. As lord of Galloway, it was very convenient for Thorfinn, as it is stated, to make frequent expeditions to Ireland and the Sudreys, and he might easily maintain his superiority over at least a part of the latter. It cannot but have contributed greatly to the power of Thorfinn, that in 1040 the famous Macbeth, son of Finnlaich, established himself on the scottish throne, having killed the above mentioned Duncan in a battle; we might even take it for granted, that Thorfinn lent his aid to his kinsman Macbeth, and was subsequently rewarded with new extensive possessions; indeed, Thorfinn according to the Orkneyinga Saga, possessed, besides the Sudreys and part of Ireland, not less than nine Earldoms in Scotland (most likely Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, Moray, Buchan, Atholl, Lorn, Argyll, Galloway), and it has been all but proved by a modern author who combines a rare extent of knowledge with no less sagacity, that what is called the dominion of Macbeth in Scotland was in reality the sway or influence exercised by Earl Thorfinn and the Norwegians of Orkney[1]. Afterwards when Malcolm Ceanmor, the Son of Duncan, aided by his relation, Earl Sigurd of Northumberland, vanquished Macbeth (1054), and drove him back towards the North, where at last he was killed in

and how well the author of the Saga must have known it, it becomes evident, that between „Caithness" and „in the place," an *and* must have been dropped by the subsequent writer, who, living about 1380, and in Iceland (this part of the Saga existing only in the *Codex Flateyensis*) might easily have dropped an „*ok*" (or the abbreviation thereof) not conscious of the great blunder be committed. „Gaddgedlar" is evidently the Norwegian corruption of „Galwydia", „Galwayth", or a Gaelic form maybe still nearer to it. From a verse, composed by the Icelander Arnor, the court-poet of Thorfinn, we learn, that he once made an inroad upon the coast „south of Man" (i. e. east of Man, Ireland being then regarded as situated north of Man), to carry away some cattle (Orkn. Saga p. 58); this expedition to Cumberland cannot have been made from Caithness, but readily from the opposite Galloway shore.

[1] Skene, „the Highlanders in Scotland" I. p. 113—116.

the battle of Lumphanan (1057)[1] Thorfinn likewise seems to have met with no inconsiderable reverses, nay, there is even good reason to believe, that he took part in the battle of 1054 (which was fought somewhere in Lothian or Fife), and lost there a son, named Dolgfinn[2]. Seeing, that Malcolm, no doubt by means of continual aid from England, was enabled even to crush Macbeth's successor Lulach of Moray, likewise a relation of Thorfinn, and (1058) to establish himself firmly on the throne, we may infer, that Thorfinn shared the fate of his relatives, and was compelled to yield at least his possessions in the South of Scotland. But how far he lost also the Sudreys, or his part thereof, it is impossible to say with anything like certainty. We learn from the Irish annals, compared with the Welsh and Cornish ones, that in the year 1058 King Harold of Norway sent a fleet under the command of his son Magnus, with men from the Orkneys, Sudreys and Dublin to attack the western part of England, but without success[3]. From this it would appear to, that Thorfinn, feeling himself too weak opposite the united force of Malcolm and the English, applied to his lord paramount, King Harold, for aid; and it would appear, that then, at least,

[1] We continue here to follow the Irish annals compared with Chron. Saxon., Fordun being utterly confuse, telling us, that Malcolm and Sigurd both together vanquished and killed Macbeth at Lumphanan in December 1056, while it is known, that Sigurd was dead already in 1055, and that the battle of Lumphanan was not fought till in August or Septbr. 1057. The battle in which Sigurd, no doubt, together with Malcolm, vanquished (but not killed) Macbeth, was that of 1054 (27 of July), it is not said where, only it must have been south of Dundee.

[2] The Ulster annals say that in this battle of 1054 fell 1500 Saxons (Englishmen) and „Dolfin Son of Finntor". „Finntor" seems to be merely a transposition of „Thorfinn"; Dolfinn or more properly *Dolgfinn* was a name usual in the Orkneys; there was afterwards an Orkneyan bishop of that name.

[3] Tighernach says: (1058) a fleet came under the guidance of the son of the King of Lochlan with the Galls of Orkney, Sudrey (*innsi Gall*) and Dublin, to conquer the kingdom of the Saxons (England), but God willed otherwise. Brut and Tywysogion: that Magnus, Son of Harold, came to England, and devastated it along with Griffith, King of Wales. Chron. Saxon.: Earl Ælfgár was expelled, but came soon back, aided by Griffith; there came even a fleet from Norway. Florence of Worcester says expressly that the Norwegians aided Ælfgár and Griffith.

the Sudreys formed still a part of Thorfinn's dominions. The Norwegian prince Magnus, a near relation to Thorfinn's wife Ingibjörg, being then only a child, and consequently not fit to command in person, it is to be supposed that be was sent partly because of this very relationship, partly in order to be proclaimed King in the countries which were to be conquered. Although this expedition was not successful, as far as regards England, we must, however, suppose, that the Norwegian superiority was maintained at least in the Isles. The strife between Thorfinn and Malcolm no doubt continued till the death of the former (1064), when his widow Ingebjörg, the mother of his two young Sons and Successors *Paul* and *Erlend*, married Malcolm, which evidently indicates, that a peace must have been concluded [1]. That the young Earls continued to keep the Sudreys, seems, therefore, most likely; this, at least, is the most natural way to account for the appearance of Godred Crowan, as we learn hereafter, in the Norwegian army at Stanfordbridge.

P. 3. Haraldus Harphagre — Harfager] This is the powerful King Harold just mentioned, who appears under the erroneous surname of „Harfager" in all English chronicles, where he is mentioned, even as early as in the almost contemporary entries in Chronicum Saxonicum. The surname of „*hárfagri*" (fair-haired) did not belong to him, but to

[1] It is generally said by the Scotch historians, upon the authority of Fordun, that Duncan, the son of Malcolm by Ingebjörg, was a bastard, which infers that there was no regular marriage between his father and mother. However, as Orkney. Saga and many others state expressly, that Ingebjörg married Malcolm, and as it is not in the least probable, that she, belonging to one of the highest families in Norway, being herself the daughter of an Earl, the widow of an Earl and the mother of two reigning Earls, should have debased herself so as to become the mistress of anybody, even of a king, the statement of Fordun must be entirely erroneous, and rest perhaps upon the sole fact, that the marriage between Malcolm and Ingebjörg, as all marriages among the Norwegians in those times, was no doubt only a civil one, contracted without any ecclesiastical formalities, but therefore not the less valid, while that which he subsequently celebrated with Margaret of England, was perhaps confirmed by the benediction of the church. After the death of Malcolm, we see also Duncan claim the crown before Eadgár, the Son of Malcolm by Margaret. — As the marriage of Malcolm with Margaret took place in 1067, it must be supposed, that Ingibjörg was dead before that time, perhaps in childbed with Duncan.

his ancestor, Harold founder of the Norwegian kingdom (853—933) who got the name on account of his beautiful yellow hair. The younger Harold, however, the one here mentioned, was called „*harðráði*“ the hard ruler, because he ruled with a strong hand. The Angles misled by the similarity of the sound, confounded both appellations. Of Harolds expedition to England and the battle of Stanfordbridge (Sept. 25. 1066) little needs to be said here, the particulars being sufficiently known from English Chronicles as well as from Norwegian Sagas. Among the vassals of Harold, who were obliged to furnish him with auxiliary troops and even to participate in the combat, were the above mentioned young Earls of Orkney, Paul and Erlend.

Godredus cognomento Crouan filius Haraldi nigri de Ysland] Godred, the founder of the royal dynasty of Man, appears here at once, nothing further being said of his ancestors or of his origin than that he was the son of Harold the black „of Ysland“. There can, however, be very little doubt, that in aspiring subsequently to the crown of Man, and really making himself king of the Island with its appendages, he vindicated only what he regarded as his hereditary right. If he had not belonged to a royal line, or if his ancestors had not enjoyed the title of King, it would have been almost impossible, according to the feelings or opinions of those days, that he should have ventured to assume it. The title of King, among the northern, nay, generally among the German tribes, was in itself strictly hereditary; it did not even cling to, or rest upon the possession of lands, but was a mere personal distinction; the word in itself, *kon-ungr*, As. *cyn-ing*, designates only „a man of family“ (*kon* or *kyn*, As. *cyn*, Got. *kuni*). Therefore even the powerful Earl Hácon, who ruled over the greater part of Norway, and had 16 Earls under himself, did never presume to decorate himself with the royal title; he belonged to an „Earl's-line“, not to a „King's-line“, and must accordingly acquiesce in the title of Earl. Taking it, consequently, for granted, that Godred descended from a royal family, and that his ancestors were kings, we think it very probable, nay, almost certain, that his grandfather was no other than the above mentioned Godred son of Harold, who was killed in 989. In those times it was a rule pretty generally observed among the northern tribes, as it is still in many parts of Norway, that the grandson got the name of the grand-

father, and this well known fact affords very often a great clue to the determination of genealogies. Now, Godred being son of Harold and having himself a son called Harold, was, likewise no doubt, a grandson of another Godred, son of Harold; and the time, in which this supposed grandfather must have lived, coincides entirely with that just indicated[1], so that there can be little doubt of their identity. Godred the elder had accordingly, as we believe, two sons, Donald, who was killed in 989, and, having a Gaelic name which was not usual in the family, seems to have been a bastard, born before his father's marriage; and Harold the father of Godred Crowan, no doubt born in wedlock, and heir to his title and estates, but younger. Harold, the father of Godred Crowan, is called „Haraldus niger *de Ysland*" in the Chronicle. This name, *Ysland*, has been construed by some interpreters as being a blunder for „Ireland", which, however, is not very probable, Ireland, being throughout the whole book always styled *Ybernia*. We will not utterly deny the possibility of perhaps *Iceland* being meant, as it would in itself be not at all unlikely, that Harold the black, after his father's death, might have retired to Iceland, as so many other Norwegian warriors from those parts did, and that his son Godred, watching every opportunity for regaining the lands of his ancestors, stepped forth to follow King Harold on his expedition. However, seing that the epitheton „de Ysland" stands here evidently as a territorial designation, but not as a mere indication of the country from whence Harold or Godred came, we are rather inclined to think, that it means neither Ireland nor Iceland, but the island of *Isla*, which in other places of the book is called *Yle*, but might for once, through a blunder or inconsequence of the writer, have been called „Ysland". It is not to be overlooked, that Godred died in the island of Isla, which may seem to involve, that he generally resided there, and that it was his paternal domain. If this be right, he appeared then, perhaps, among the followers of Harold as a vassal either of the King himself or of the Orkneyan Earls. — Godred the Son of Sytric (i. e. Sigtryggr), who reigned in Man, when Godred Crowan came there, seems, to judge from his patronymic name, to have belonged to the dy-

[1] When Godred himself lived in the times of Edward Confessor and William the Conqueror, his father must have been the contemporary of Cnut, and his grandfather of Æðelréd and Edward martyr.

nasty of Dublinian kings; perhaps even he was himself King of Dublin. The Irish annals say, that when Diarmid, king of Leinster, (A. Ch. 1052) had vanquished and put to flight the king of Dublin, Eachmargath (in the Sagas called Margaðr), son of Ragnvald (Reginald), he was for some time Lord of Dublin, together with his son Murchad, who made the Island of Man tributary (A. Ch. 1060), having defeated „Mac Reginald" (the son of Ragnvald).[1] After the fall of Diarmid, however, in 1072, we find on the royal throne of Dublin one Godred, „grandson of Ragnvald" who died in 1075, and after him another Godred, called „Mananagh" (he of Man), who ruled till 1094, and died in 1095, being, as we shall see, no other person than Godred Crowan.[2] Now it seems scarcely to admit of any doubt, that the first mentioned Godred, grandson of Ragnvald, was no other person, than the Godred son of Sytric in our Chronicle, and that consequently, the anonymous „Son of Ragnvald" who was defeated by Murchad in 1060, was Sytric or Sigtrygg, the father of Godred. It must be supposed, that Godred, having hereditary right to Dublin, returned thither immediately after the fall of Diarmid, the usurpator. To be sure, the Chr. of Man assign to the death of Godred the year 1051, which, as the battle of Stanfordbridge is said to have taken place in 1047, ought to signify 1070. Yet we have already had instances enough to prove, that the years of Christ given in the earlier part of the Chronicle, are generally erroneous, and must be corrected by comparison with other statements. Now, as Godred Crowan (as will be seen hereafter) died in 1095, and our Chronicle states expressly, that he reigned over Man for 16 years from the time of the conquest, this event must have taken place in 1079 or 1080, not, as our Chronicle has it, in 1074 or 1075 (signified by 1056). Here, therefore, is a miscalculation of four (or rather 23), or five (24) years, and this difference added to 1070 (1051), in which our Chr. place the death of Godred, make exactly 1074 or 1075. Moreover, there exists still a letter, written in A. C. 1074 by Godred „rex Hiberniæ" to Archbishop Landfranc of Canterbury, requesting the consecration of Gillepatrick, elected bishop of Dublin after the demise of Duncan[3], and as this Godred

[1] Annals of the Four Masters.

[2] Tighernach, and Annals of Ulster.

[3] Baronii Annales, t. XI. p. 641. Here also the answer of Landfranc to God-

cannot possibly be Godred Crowan, it must have been Godred the son of Sigtrygg, who, accordingly, did still live in 1074. (In the Cronicles of Ulster there is subsequently an entry for the Year 1087, purporting that the „grandsons of Ragnvald", accompanied by the Son of the King of Ulster, went to Man with a fleet, but were killed. These must have been the brothers of Godred, and perhaps even his son, the exiled Fingall, of whom no more is said in our Chronicle, although there is no mention made of his being killed, when Godred Crowan conquered the Island. Very likely, therefore, he retired to Ireland, his proper home, from whence he afterwards made the unsuccessful expedition just mentioned.

All these facts, however, seem sufficiently to prove, that during the interval between the death of Godred the son of Harold, in 989, and the accession of Godred Crowan, in 1079 or 1080, the Island of Man must have been an appendage of the Norwegian kingdom of Dublin, whereas it would appear, that the Isles chiefly belonged to the Earls of Orkney.

As to the tale of the manner, in which Godred Crowan conquered Man, and became the real owner of the soil, it seems very likely, that this is a kind of anachronism, and that tradition, not supported by authentic records, have assigned to the Godred of 1080, what, if, after all, it was a real fact, belonged to another Godred of much earlier times, the hero of popular legends, who was identified with the Godred of later days, because the historical traditions in the Island itself did not reach farther backward. A legendary character pervades the whole narrative. What especially seems to remind us of an age much earlier than 1080, is the account of Godred's having acquired the personal property of the soil, excluding the hereditary rights of the inhabitants. The same tale almost is told of the conqueror of Norway, Harold hárfagri, who is said to have appropriated to himself all udal (óðal, hereditary lands), so that henceforth the possessors of lands did not retain them in their own right, but had them only in farm or fief from the King. Something like it is even told of the Conqueror-Kings of Denmark in the 9th century, and of Einar, Earl of Orkney, who lived at the same time; indeed, there can be no doubt that the same or similar legends only with local varia-

red is inserted, showing, that Godred at this time was the reigning king of Dublin. Landfranc gives him the title of „rex Hiberniæ."

tions, existed all over the German world, where kingdoms or lordships had been founded by conquest, in which case the property of the soil always, or generally, was allotted to the conqueror. Now, as the conquest of the Isle of Man by the Norwegians must have taken place in the 9th century, it is also more likely, that the acquisition of the dominium glebæ by the Conqueror must have taken place then, than afterwards. It is even not improbable that the surname of Crowan belonged to that Conqueror, and not to the Godred of 1080, only the Inhabitants of Man, knowing that Godred Crowan was their first Norwegian king, but not remembering any older than Godred son of Harold the black, identified this Godred with the hero of the legend. If we are not mistaken, it is, or has at least been usual in the isle of Man itself, to assign to Godred Crowan some of the oldest pagan monuments without inscriptions, found in the Island, greatly anterior to the times of the Christian Godred here spoken of; and this seems to prove, that the national legends of Man always regarded Godred Crowan as representing the oldest possible times of the Norwegian settlement in the Island. Even what is told of the awe, which he is said to have inspired the Scots, bears evidently a true legendary character. Putting aside, therefore, in this manner, from the history of Godred, as it is told here, what seems to us not strictly historical, we retain as undisputed the fact of his having conquered Man, and the subsequent conquest of Dublin &c. which is fully confirmed by Irish annals.

The death of Godred the Conqueror is expressly stated in the Irish annals to have taken place in 1095. In the Norwegian saga of King Hácon IV, the accuracy of which is amply proved, it is said that King Magnus took the Isles from Godred, which shows, that Godred must needs have outlived at least the first expedition of Magnus to the Western Islands, which took place in 1093—94. Consequently, the final conquest of Man by Godred, which is stated in the Chronicle itself to have been effected about 16 years before his death, must have taken place in 1079 or 1080, not in 1075 as the Chronicle has it, that is to say, when the 19 years are added, of which all the numbers, given in the codex from A. C. 1046 downwards till 1093 are shortcoming.

P. 4. *Reliquit sane tres filios, Lagmannum, Haraldum et Olavum; Lagmannus major natu, regnum arripiens, septem annos regnavit.* The account

here given is neither complete nor accurate. It is obvious, that in the space between 1095, the real death-year of Godred, and 1098, when King Magnus made his great expedition to the West, there can be no place for the seven years of Lagman's reign, and the subsequent, however short, reigns of Donald and Ingemund. The fault must be corrected partly through the Irish annals, partly through the Saga, which likewise being faulty in this point, are in their turn to be rectified by means of the indications contained in those scraps of poems composed by contemporaneous scalds or poets, which, as usually, are quoted in the text itself to corroborate the narrative, but which even the author of the Saga has not understood rightly. The Saga of King Magnus does not speak of any expedition to the West, undertaken by this warlike king previous to that in 1098, while it can be sufficiently proved, that he undertook one already in the latter part of 1093, from which he returned in 1094. In the first instance, one of those poetical fragments just mentioned speak of King Magnus getting hold of Lagman and keeping him for some time in captivity, which was impossible in 1098, Lagman being then dead and gone; nay, the narrative of the text itself, founded upon these poems at large and verbal traditions, speaks of Godred the father of Lagman in terms implying that he was still living, when Magnus captured his son[1]. This shows, that the first expedition of Magnus at all events took place before 1095. Secondly, Fordun, narrating the events immediately succeeding the death of King Malcolm Ceanmhor in the month of November 1093, says that the brother of Malcolm, Donald Bane, who had resided for a long time in the Isles, was now proclaimed king by a powerful party, and appearing at the head of an army, supported by the Norwegian king, attacked Edinburgh, and got possession of the crown for six months, when he was driven away by Duncan, the son of Malcolm[2]. These particulars, here mentioned by Fordun, must be looked upon as singularly trustworthy, as they are mostly taken from the annals composed by Thurgot, Prior in Durham and bishop of St. Andrews, who was an eye-witness of all these events, and, moreover, had resided for a long time in Norway at the court of King Olaf Kyrri, predecessor and father of King Magnus, who therefore must have been

[1] Snorre, Saga of Magnus Barefoot, Ch. 20. 21.

[2] Fordun V. 25-28.

personally known to him, and was no doubt always observed by him with an interest excluding all possibility of any mistake.[1] Thus it is evident, that King Magnus was present in Scotland at the head of a fleet or an army immediately after the death of Malcolm, which shows, that his first expedition to the West took place towards the end of 1093. His father having died on the 22 Sept. 1093, it could not have been undertaken before that time. The author of the Saga, however, not being aware of the true series of the events, blends both expeditions, that of 1093 and that of 1098, into one, and quotes the verses illustrating the former promiscuously with others referring to the latter, so that it is even sometimes impossible or at least difficult to tell, what ought to be assigned to the expedition of 1093, and what belongs to that of 1098. So much, however, is sure enough, that whenever we find Lagman or his father mentioned, we may safely refer the particulars therewith connected to the first expedition. This question being thus sufficiently settled, we return to the seven years assigned by our Chronicle to the Reign of Lagman. If this number is not altogether a mistake, it is evident from what we have just seen, that the period of seven years must begin during the life-time of Godred, and Lagman have been his co-regent or under-king. And indeed, the Saga seems to indicate something of just this very kind. It is said here, that Godred

[1] Fordun here frequently quotes Thurgot, whose words he seems to have downright transcribed without any alterations. The fates of Thurgot are mentioned by his *confrater* Simeon of Durham (*historia Dunnelmensis ecclesiæ*, ap. Twysden, p. 206, 207). Thurgot, being one of the hostages for Lindsey, who were to be delivered to King William, escaped to Norway about 1069, and was very friendly received by King Olaf, who took him to his court, and loaded him with honours and presents; it is expressly stated, that Thurgot taught him to chaunt the psalms. After a stay of some years at the Norwegian court, and being richly endowed by the King and his magnates, he returned to England, but suffered shipwreck on the English coast, losing all his wealth; he met, however, with a kind reception from archbishop Walcher of York, at whose recommendation he was received as monk in the monastery of St. Mary at Durham, where in 1086 he succeeded the Prior Aldwine, and having administered the priorate for 20 years, was created bishop of St. Andrews in Scotland (1106), whence, however, he returned afterwards to his cloister and died there 1115, leaving the annals above mentioned, which unhappily have been lost, and are only known from the fragments given by Fordun.

had appointed Lagman his lieutenant in and defender of the northern islands[1], and that King Magnus, striving to get hold of him, persecuted him from island to island, until he caught him near the Isle of Skye, being on the point to cross over to Ireland, and kept him in chains for a while. Here it is impossible to construe the words as if Godred were already dead; he is evidently understood by the author to be still alive. And indeed, as Godred, according to the Irish annals, was so much occupied with his affairs in Ireland, and no doubt even regarded Dublin as his principal seat, it was quite natural that he should entrust his other kingdom, or at least the northern part thereof, to his eldest son and heir presumptive. It is likewise not to be doubted, that Lagman intended going to Ireland because his father was there. Even some more light may be thrown on these things from other sources. Ordericus Vitalis, who generally is very accurate and trustworthy, says that the reason, why King Magnus made the great expedition in 1098, was this, that having made a treaty with the Irish King Muircertach, and even married his daughter, he found that Muircertach played him false, wherefore he also sent him his daughter back, and afterwards in person went to the West with a powerful fleet.[2] Although this certainly was not the sole motive, why Magnus went away, yet there is no reason to question the facts themselves; the treaty here spoken of must accordingly have taken place before 1098, that is to say, during the first expedition in 1093 - 94. And why was this treaty made? The Irish annals explain it. Muircertach, grandson of Brian Boromy, who had succeeded his father Tirdelvagh in 1080 as King of Munster, was engaged in a fierce war with his rival to the supreme power, Donald O'Lochlan, King of Ulster. In 1094 the war raged in the neighborhood of Dublin, and among the princes who fought on Donald's side was Godred, who had brought no less than 90 ships. Muircertach was at first completely routed, but afterwards returning, he got the upper hand over Godred, and expelled him from Dublin[3]. Remembering that just at the same time King Magnus was with his fleet near the coasts

[1] In the verse of the Scald Gisle, Lagman is called Ívistar gramr (the prince of of Uist) which seems to indicate, that he resided there.

[2] Ordericus Vitalis, ed. Duchesne, p. 767.

[3] Annals of Ulster, and of the Four Masters.

of Ireland, we are justified in making the combination, that Muircertach sought and obtained his alliance against Godred, and that Magnus took Lagman prisoner chiefly to have a hold upon the father, who might thereby be so much easier compelled to resign his lordship of Dublin to Muircertach. We have, moreover, an authority in the Saga itself for King Magnus having helped Muircertach to take Dublin, forasmuch as it is said, that this was done in 1102, on the last expedition of Magnus to the West.[1] But as it is sure enough, that the capture of Dublin by Muircertach did already take place in 1094, and it has been sufficiently shown, that the author of the Saga sometimes assigns to one of the three expeditions what belongs to another, we are fully entitled to believe, that the same error has been committed here, and that the Author, in speaking of this event, is not mistaken as to the fact, but only as to the time, which was 1094, not 1102. What became of Lagman, the Saga does not tell, but finding him afterwards as King of the Isles, and remembering the statement in the Saga of King Hácon, that King Magnus conquered the Isles from Godred, we must needs guess, that he was given free on condition, that his father not only ceded Dublin to Muircertach, but even, together with Lagman, did homage to the Norwegian King, and acknowledged him as their liege lord. It is said in the annals of Ulster, that Godred died in the year after his expulsion from the plague, or, according to another translation, of a broken heart.[2] If this be the right one, his grief may have been caused partly by his reverses in Ireland, partly by the feuds between his sons. For from what is explained above, it would appear, that the rebellion of Harold against his brother Lagman had begun during the life-time of Godred; the seven years of Lagman's reign being no doubt to be reckoned from 1089 or perhaps even 1088, the very year, when the war broke out between Muircertach and Donald. Lagman's death on his voyage to Jerusalem being known at home in 1096 or 1097 (the year 1075 or 1095 given in the Chronicle cannot possibly be admitted, being the death-year of Godred) he must have left his country early in 1096, and cannot have gone very far, when the death

[1] Saga of Magnus Barefoot, Ch. 34.

[2] Annales Ultonienses, ed. O'Connor, and the latin translation of them in Johnstone's Antiquitates Celto-Normannicae.

overtook him. It was no doubt his intention to join the Crusaders, now flocking together on their first expedition under Peter of Amiens. The catastrophe with his brother Harold did probably occur in the later part of 1095, immediately after the death of Godred.

p. 5. Dompnaldum filium Tadc. The name Tadc, Tadg or Teige is a not uncommon Irish name, and appears especially to have occurred in the O'Brian family. The youngest son of Brian Boromy, who was present at his death, and according to the Njála Saga, lost his hand by the same blow, which cut off the head of his father, was called „Tadg," in the Saga *Taðkr;* and it is not improbable that the Dompnald or Donald, who was sent to Man by Muircertach, himself the grandson of Brian, was a descendant of Tadg, or at least a kinsman of the O'Brians. That the Manxmen should apply to Miurcertach for a governor, seems to prove, that King Magnus must have entrusted him with a kind of plenipotentiary power or lieutenancy during his absence, which trust, however, Muircertach must be supposed not to have kept conscientiously.

Ingemundus. Of this Ingemund not the least is told in the Saga. It is not even possible to guess, who he was, or to what family he belonged.

Fundata est abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Cystercii. This entry, as well as the next, about the capture of Antiochia and the apparition of the comet, is taken from the Chronicle of Melrose. The rest, however, including the definition of a Comet, is original. The battle here spoken of between the inhabitants of Man seems rather to have been the effect of an attempt on the part of the native Manxmen to shake off the yoke of the Norwegians, than a fighting between northern or southern Islanders, the name of the opposite chiefs, Earl Other or Ottar, and Macmaras, the former being a Norwegian one, the latter a Celtic. The word „Aquilonares" ought perhaps to be translated, not „the inhabitants of North-Man", but „the Northmen."

p. 6. Eodem anno Magnus rex Norwegiæ &c. It is true, that King Magnus made his second Expedition to the West in 1098, and in so far the Chronicle is right, but it errs greatly in speaking of one expedition only, and of the fall of King Magnus, which did not occur till 1103, on his third expedition, as if it happened on his second one. The whole entry comprises accordingly a space of 6 years, from 1098 till 1103 *inclusivè.* Nor is the motive here assigned to his enterprise the true one,

as everybody may see, even without farther explanation; it may have been a legend or tradition, current in Man, but even this tradition seems to have been derived from what is told in the Saga of the Grandfather of Magnus, King Harold, that on the eve of his sailing for England in 1066, he had the shrine of St. Olaf opened, cut the nails and the hair of the Saint, and having re-closed and locked the shrine threw the key in to the sea; it is expressly added, that the Shrine was not opened for the next 180 years, so that it is impossible that King Magnus could have done it.[1] The real motive, why Magnus issued forth on this expedition, was evidently, as the Saga tells, to secure his power in the Orkneys and the western islands. We learn farther from Ordericus Vitalis, as we have seen, that Muircertach bad broken the treaty; and the troubles in the Isle of Man just mentioned might in themselves alone have afforded sufficient reason for Magnus to revisit that part of his dominions. Moreover, we learn from Fordun, that in 1097, Eadgar, the son of King Malcolm appeared in Scotland with an English army, and made fierce war upon Donald Bane, the protegé of King Magnus, who had reascended the throne in 1095, after the fall of Duncan, and this war, which ended with the captivity of Donald, was not brought to an issue, when Magnus arrived to Scotland in 1098:[2] it is therefore very probable, that Donald Bane had implored the aid of Magnus, and was the chief inducement for the latter to go.

The fleet of King Magnus is stated by Ordericus to have contained 60 ships[3], while our Saga gives the number of 160. This is to be explained in this way, that the total number of ships collected in Norway was 160, but that the effective force, with which he arrived at Man and Anglesey, consisted only of 60. The fleets of the Norwegian kings in those days were formed of two distinct parts, the *leiðangr* ships, i. e. those furnished and manned by the population at large, distributed for this purpose in certain districts, and those belonging to the King himself and his barons; the former being generally of the smaller kind, and the crew not obliged to serve for more than 2 months a year, did

[1] Snorre, Saga of Harold Harðráði Ch. 83 cfr. Hrokkinskinna, Har. H. S. Ch. 114.

[2] Fordun, V. 34. X. 19.

[3] Ordericus Vitalis, ap. Duchêne, p. 767.

not count for much, but the chief and really formidable force consisted of the other part, being large, well built ships, strongly manned by exquisite, well trained warriors, and obliged to serve for an indefinite time. Generally therefore we find, that on expeditions of longer duration the *leiðangr*-ships soon returned home, leaving the royal and baronial ships alone to fight out the war; and the average number of these ships was exactly sixty. So it therefore must also have been the case with the fleet of King Magnus, that shortly after his arrival to the West the *leiðangr* part returned, while the main force, being sixty sails strong, remained. The Saga gives us the names of several barons, who accompanied the King, we learn even, that he brought with him his son Sigurd, then only eight years of age, in order to appoint him his lieutenant in those parts. The Chronicle is right in saying that King Magnus subdued the Orkneys, as we learn from the Saga, that at his arrival he took the reigning Earls Paul and Erlend, prisoners, and sent them to Norway, whence they did not return while he carried with him the sons of Erlend, Magnus (afterwards Saint Magnus), and Erling; the Earls must therefore either have shown symptoms of disaffection, or the King simply have wanted these possessions for himself or for his son. In the Saga, Magnus is said next to have attacked and ravaged Lewis, when the inhabitants were either massacred or put to flight, no doubt in retaliation of what was done to Ingemund; even Uist, Skye, Tirce and Mull underwent the same treatment. Jona, however, was left unhurt, because of its sanctity, and the Saga tells, that the King opened „the little church of Columkill“. (now St. Oran's Chapel) and was about to enter, but stopped on the threshold, locked the door, and forbade anybody to enter it afterwards. It is added, that since that time it was not opened, which, however, is only to be understood of the period before 1220, when this account appears to have been written [1]. From Jona be went to Isla, and from there to Cantire, ravaging as well the coasts of Ireland as those of Scotland; perhaps it was at this period, that he sent the Irish princess back to her father. Ordericus says, that he found the coasts of Ireland too well defended, to effect any great achievements, the annals of Ulster say even, that three Norwegian ships were taken by the Ultonians, and the men killed.

[1] Snorre, Saga of Magn. Baref. Ch. 10. Fagrskinna Ch. 229. 230.

Cumque applicuisset ad insulam sancti Patricii .... nuncupantur.] This seems to imply, that the place named *Sandvað* (*vadum arenosum*), where the battle was fought between the inhabitants of Man themselves, was situated in the neighborhood of Holm Peel. That Magnus, as it is stated here, should have chosen Man for his own future residence, is impossible, and only an exaggeration; he destined it probably to be the residence of his son and vassal King Sigurd, and not for himself as the author may have supposed. What, however, is said about the fortresses erected by Magnus seems to be true, firstly, because these fortresses bore still his name, when this part of the chronicle was composed, viz. about 1260, secondly, because we find, that King Magnus erected similar forts at other conquered places, which he desired to secure, for instance at Kvaldensey in the lake of Wener in Sweden, against which he made war in 1100 and 1101. This fortress was chiefly of wood, a kind of block-house; as even those in Man seem to have been, as it is expressly stated, that the Galwegians were pressed to cut wood and carry timber for their construction. It is no doubt the same fact, to which Ordericus Vitalis alludes, saying that King Magnus got people to settle on the island, as the population was extremely thinned, and gave them houses and other necessary things, and that likewise he visited some of the other Islands, and arranged large settlements there, occupying himself with these affairs for several years, in order to strengthen his power[1]. It may be that not a few of his warriors, pleased with the fertility and amenity of the Island, settled there permanently, and that new colonists from Norway were sent for and encouraged, but the houses here mentioned were no doubt chiefly the fortresses. If quite a new colonization had taken place in the large scale, which Orderic seems to indicate, the Saga would certainly not have been silent about it.

Ad Moiniam insulam &c.] This affair, and the combat with the both Hugos, is mentioned also in the Sagas, as well as by most of the English annalists, who narrated the events of these times. The Saga, however, as usual, describes only the fight, without mentioning the motives, which caused it. These we learn chiefly from Caradoc of Lhancarvan and Ordericus Vitalis. There raged at this time a fierce war between

[1] Ordericus, p. 767.

the Welsh and Norman Earls of the Marches, the principal of whom was Hugh, Earl of Chester, called *grossus* because of his extreme fatness[1]. In the beginning of A. C. 1098, Hugh, together with his namesake, Hugh of Montgomery Earl of Salop, aided by a traitor among the Welsh themselves, attacked North-Wales with a large army, and penetrated without any obstacle, as far as into Anglesey, the Welsh king Griffith and his relation Cadogan being unable to make any resistance, proceeded to Ireland to apply for assistance against the invaders. When it would appear, although it is not expressly stated anywhere, that Griffith on his way visited Man, and solicited King Magnus, whose arrival in these parts with a powerful fleet must have been generally known, to help him; or that Magnus, hearing of the doings at Anglesey, resolved to go there on his own accord, and endeavour to gain something for himself. According to Orderic, he came with only six ships, and entered the Menai Straits, carrying a red shield on the mast, the usual sign of peace and commercial intercourse. The Norman warriors, however, would not permit him to land; and assembled in great number under the command of both Hughs; there ensued in consequence vehement fighting or rather exchange of missiles, the Normans being on shore, the Norwegians on board their ships. Hugh of Salop was killed by an arrow, and finally the Normans were put to flight. According to the Saga, it was the King himself, who shot Earl Hugh, or who at least got the credit of having done so; his ship, it is told, being nearest to the shore, he stood on the forecastle shooting arrows from a long-bow at the enemy, and seeing Earl Hugh advancing he persuaded a man from Halogaland (the northernmost part of Norway) who was standing close by, likewise shooting, that they should both at once aim at the Earl; this done, one of the arrows struck the „*nefbjörg*“ (the piece of iron protecting the nose), and caused it to bend sidewards; the other entered the eye and came out behind, killing the Earl immediately: it was, however, impossible to say, which of the two arrows was shot by the King, yet the man, to flatter the King, gave him the honour of having shot the fatal one. It was, says the Saga, a most singular luck

[1] Even in the Saga he is called *Hugi digri* (i. e. the fat); the same epithet is preserved by Ordericus, calling him „*dirgane*“, which is only a wrong spelling of the Norse „*digran*“ (acc. sing. of *digr*).

to hit the Earl in this way, as he was clad in armour from head to foot, leaving nothing bare except the eyes. Giraldus Cambrensis, who narrates this event, obviously from local evidences, without knowing a word of the Sagas, strongly corroborates the above narrative, and does not even hesitate in the least to name the commander of the foreign ships, whom he apparently does not know to have been the King of Norway, as the killer of the Earl. When Hugh of Salop, he says, together with the Earl of Chester, had entered by force the church of St. Tefredauc in Anglesey, and left some dogs there, these were found mad in the morning; and a month afterwards he came himself to an untimely end, as there arrived some pirates with ships of war from Orkney, whom he gallantly went to meet into the very sea, bestriding a noble steed; the commander of the enemy's force, however, named Magnus, standing with his bow forward in his ship, let fly an arrow, which, although the Earl was clad in iron armour from head to foot, entered his right eye, and went through the brains, so that he fell dying into the water; when the victor saw him falling, he is said to have exclaimed triumphantly in the Danish tongue *leit loupe*, i. e. „let leap", and from this time the English lost their dominion in Anglesey[1]. According to Ordericus[2], King Magnus, having ascertained that it was the Earl himself whom he had killed, expressed his regret, and offered Earl Hugh of Chester peace and security, saying that he had come to conquer Ireland, not England, nor other foreign lands, and only to maintain his authority in Islands already belonging to his dominions. Here, however, Ordericus must be mistaken, as it is certain, that he appropriated to himself the dominion of Anglesey, and that this Island was for many years reckoned among the Norwegian possessions in the West[3]. Even William of Malmesbury asserts, that Magnus „fiercely assaulted England in attacking Anglesey"[4].

[1] Giraldus, Itinerarium Cambriæ, p. 867. The „leit loupe" is a slight prevarication of the Norwegian „*lát hlaupa*".

[2] Orderic. p. 768. As the place, where the battle was fought, he names the rock Dagannoth, where the lieutenant of Earl Hugh of Chester, Robert Marquis of Rhuddlar, had built a castle (cfr. p. 670).

[3] Ordericus seems on the whole not to be thoroughly acquainted with these facts, as he contradicts himself in some points.

[4] William of Malmesbury. IV. 329.

Nor is it improbable, that the Welsh of Anglesey, who reaped the sole fruit of the battle which cost Magnus dearly, gratified him with a show of homage, by which, they did not mean to bind themselves very strictly, and which could not in any case have been so burthensome to them as the English yoke. It is told by Caradoc, that Magnus, on his last expedition to the West, in 1102—3, was kindly received in Anglesey, and got the permission of Griffith to cut as much timber there as he wanted. Perhaps this, was construed by the Norwegians as a sign of submission on the side of Griffith and his Welshmen [1].

It was undoubtedly the intention of Magnus at this time to punish Muircertach, but he was prevented from doing so, either by his severe loss in the battle of Anglesey, or as is probable, by the necessity in which he may have found himself to turn his forces against Scotland. As at this time, it would seem, Eadgar, the son of Malcolm, had captured his rival Donald Bane, and as Donald was the ancient ally of Magnus, it was but natural that the latter should intercede on his behalf, and attempt to effect his delivery. It is even far from improbable that Eadgar, not acknowledging the right of Magnus to the Isles, had expressed his intention to reunite them with the Crown of Scotland, and that Magnus, hearing of this, deemed it necessary to threaten him with an attack. The Saga tells, that the King of the Scots sent a message to Magnus, asking him to abstain from hostilities against Scotland, and offering him the cession of all those western Islands, between which and the mainland the Norwegian king could go in a vessel with rudder, on which condition peace really was concluded. This evidently infers that Magnus had threatened Eadgar with war, and as the thing in itself is very probable, there is all reason to believe the whole transaction to be strictly true. Magnus may have ascertained, that Donald Bane, now being blind and degraded, was past hope of ever recovering the power, and therefore found the best thing he could do, was to make peace with Eadgar on good conditions. It is even most likely, that it was agreed to strengthen the treaty by a marriage between Magnus and Mathilda the sister of Eadgar. For in the Saga there are still three verses preserved, composed by Magnus himself in honour of „Mathilda, the fair maid, who defends her country with the shield", and whom he

[1] William of Malmesbury. IV. 329.

is most anxious to behold, but fears that he shall not enjoy this happiness [1]. In the Saga this Mathilda is called the daughter of the Emperor, but there was at this time no daughter of the Emperor with the name of Mathilda, nor is it likely, even if such a person existed, that Magnus should have proposed to her. The Saga moreover is mistaken in calling the Scottish king Malcolm instead of Eadgar, no doubt misled by the Scottish denomination „Etgar Mac Malcolm.“ It is certain the marriage was never effected, Mathilda being given to King Henry of England already in 1100; this, however, explains itself readily from the superiority of King Henry in those parts, and even the substance of the verses themselves indicate the misgivings of the royal author, that the union so much coveted was not to be after all. Certain it is, that from this time the Norwegian kings dated their real possession of the Sudreys, among which they also counted the peninsula of Cantire; because Magnus, imitating the old fabulous sea-king Beite, of whom a similar story is told, had his vessel drawn across the narrow isthmus of Tarbet, while he himself sat at the helm.

It is said in the Saga, that during this expedition King Magnus effected a marriage between his son Sigurd, then only nine years of age, with Biadmuin, the daughter of Muircertach, being only five years old, and that he constituted him king of all Norwegian possessions in the West. That the marriage did not take place till in 1102, on the King's third expedition, is evident from the Irish and Welsh annals, as will be seen bye and bye; and it is most likely, nay, almost certain, that the Saga has likewise misplaced the other event, the proper moment for conferring on the prince the title of King being surely the day of his marriage, especially as Sigurd had then just completed his 12th year, which was the very term for coming of age among the Norwegians in those times. Between Muircertach and Magnus there was apparently no contact at all during this expedition, whatever might have been the cause. That Magnus intended to make war upon him, must be regarded as certain, but no doubt as we have already seen, that the preparations of Muircertach himself, and partly the expeditions of Magnus against Wales and Scotland, averted the blow from Ireland in 1098. He passed, however, the winter either at Man or in the Isles, probably

[1] Snorre, Saga of Magn. Barefoot, Ch. 18.

intending to attack Ireland in the spring of 1099, but it is expressly stated in the Saga, that many of his men, wearied by being absent from their home for such a length of time, left him without leave before the winter set in. We might guess therefore, that when spring returned, he did not feel himself strong enough to invade Ireland, with the certainty of effecting anything worth the exertion. Moreover, as soon after his return to Norway we find him engaged in a war with Sweden, it may be, that the news received from those parts induced him to shorten his stay in the West, and to forego for the moment his plans against Ireland, postponing them till better times. This indeed appears to us the simplest way of explaining the matter. Certain it seems, that King Magnus, on his return to Norway in the summer 1099, left his son Sigurd at Orkney.

The Saga remarks expressly, that during this long stay in the West King Magnus and his men adopted the dress usual among the western Islanders, viz. short coats and bare legs, which caused the Norwegians to give him the nickname of „bare-leg“ or „bare-foot.“ This shows, that the characteristic Highland dress was even then, the national one among the inhabitants of western Scotland.

In the years of 1100 and 1101 Magnus was occupied with the Swedish war. In 1102, however, he went forth on his last expedition, which this time was undertaken directly against Ireland. What the Chronicle tells about his sending his shoes to King Muircertach and the unconditional submission of the latter, seems to be a mere fable; yet if something like it took place, it must have been in the winter immediately preceding the expedition. From the Irish and Welsh annals as well as from Orderic we learn how matters stood with Muircertach. His war with Donald O'Lochlan raged more fiercely than ever, and although, in the whole, Muircertach had the upper hand, yet Donald was an obstinate and dangerous foe, against whom he felt the necessity of strengthening himself through alliance with other powerful rulers. Shortly before, King Henry (Beauclerc) had ascended the English throne, excluding, as it is well known, his senior brother Robert Duke of Normandy, with whom he had to sustain a hard feud. Among the Barons, who embraced the party of Robert, were the two brothers of the above mentioned Earl Hugh Montgomery, who was killed by King Magnus,

Robert of Belesme, who after the fall of Hugh had purchased his Earldom, having besides many other possessions in England as well as in Normandy[1], and Arnulf, who had Dyved and Pembroke in Wales. Robert made an alliance with the three Welsh princes, Jorwerth, Cadagan and Meredith, sons of Blethyn, and Arnulf sought the alliance of Muircertach, asking, through ambassadors, his daughter Lafracot in marriage, to which Muircertach immediately gave his consent, promising not only to support Arnulf against the English King, but also to make him his successor[2]. In this manner, a rather strong ligue had been formed against King Henry, and as the allied lords and princes, especially the two Montgomerys, as avengers of their brother, must at the same time have been the enemies of King Magnus, this prince was consequently brought somehow in a friendly relation to the English monarch, notwithstanding that Henry, if the conjecture which we ventured to utter above be right, had married the destined bride of Magnus. Yet it must be remembered, that Magnus himself, during his absence, had married the Swedish princess Margaret, and no doubt given up all enmity, if any such existed, against Henry, while, through the peace concluded in 1098 with Eadgar of Scotland the friend and *protégé* of the English Kings, a reconciliation between their party and King Magnus may already be said to have been partly effected.

We learn from the Welsh chronicles and the Irish annals, that Magnus before visiting Ireland landed at Man, where he, as it were, established his head quarters, erecting forts as before, and making a personal visit to Anglesey, where prince Griffith received him cordially and, as mentioned above, gave him permission to cut what timber he might require for his fortifications[3]. Meanwhile matters had gone wrong with the Hiberno-british ligue. Robert of Montgomery was declared an outlaw, and several of his castles taken; one of the Welsh princes had been induced to embrace the King's part, Arnulf of Montgomery had betaken himself to the court of Muircertach, craving assistance, but the latter, far from being able to afford any, on the contrary was expecting aid

[1] Ordericus, p. 768. In Maine there exist still traditions about the tyranny of Robert, vide Lappenberg, Geschichte Englands II. s. 232.

[2] Ordericus, p. 868, cfr. Caradoc.

[3] vide Caradoc.

from Arnulf against Magnus [1]. Under these circumstances Muircertach found it safest first to make peace or truce for a year with Donald O'Lochlan, and then to enter into negociations with Magnus. In what manner these negociations were conducted, is nowhere told, we learn only from the Irish annals, that the peace was concluded for a year (no doubt to be renewed at the expiration of this term), and that Muircertach gave his daughter in marriage to Sigurd, the son of Magnus, who was now proclaimed King of the western possessions [2]. It has already been mentioned, that the Saga wrongly speaks of this marriage as having taken place during the former expedition of Magnus, and that it likewise wrongly makes Magnus and Muircertach together conquer Dublin in 1102, this conquest having been effected already during the first expedition of Magnus, in 1093. Yet it would seem, and it must be taken almost for certain, that by the treaty of 1102 Muircertach ceded to Magnus the district of Dublin, which may have been regarded as an appendage of the kingdom of Man, partly because it is not likely that Magnus should have accorded to Muircertach the peace, and moreover, as will be seen, his powerful assistance against Donald O'Lochlan for nothing, partly because Ordericus states expressly, that Magnus established colonies of Northmen even in Ireland [3], which could not have been done, if he had not got a territory to dispose of. And lastly, if there be any truth at bottom in the anecdote about the shoes, it is to be supposed, that Muircertach acknowledged Magnus as his suzerain, and paid a kind of homage to him as such, not, however, in-

[1] There is a letter preserved from Muircertach to the celebrated Anselme, Archbishop of Canterbury (*Anselmi epistolæ* IV. 83.), in which the Irish King thanks the Prelate for the assistance given to his son in law Arnulf. The letter must have been written about this time.

[2] The Irish annals, especially those of the Four Masters, where it is expressly stated, that Muircertach gave his daughter to „Sichraid“ son of Magnus, with many precious gifts. Caradoc says expressly, that Magnus built 3 castles in the Isle of Man, had his son married with the daughter of Muircertach, and named him King of Man. The name of the Princess has been preserved in the Saga only, it was Biadmynja or Biadhmuin.

[3] Ordericus, p. 812. „Magnus — — . desertas cum ingenti classe insulas usque in Hiberniam introivit, ibique colonis callide constitutis, oppida et villas aliarum more gentium construi præcepit.“

tending to keep any of the given promises longer than necessity compelled him to do so. Ordericus states expressly, that Muircertach acted treacherously towards Magnus, as well as towards Arnulf. It is easy to see from the following facts, that the principal object of Muircertach was to crush his Irish rivals, and that to this end be deemed it necessary to secure the powerful assistance of Magnus, with the hope, perhaps, of having afterwards an opportunity to get rid of him. The treaty was strengthened by giving hostages from both sides. Among the Norwegian hostages was the Icelandic poet Gisl Illugason [1], from whose poem in honour of King Magnus several fragments are quoted in the Saga, to corroborate the facts there mentioned.

Arriving, then, in Ireland, Magnus was friendly received by Muircertach and no doubt got possession of Dublin with its district, where he effected the settlements spoken of by Orderic, which appear rather to have been castles and strongholds, like those erected in Man and the Isles. In the winter, the Saga tells, Magnus was the guest of Muircertach in his residence of Kinkora [2], and in the next spring, it is farther told, both Kings went to Ulster, where they fought many battles, and conquered a part of Ulster. This is true in so far as really the hostilities between Muircertach and the northern Irish commenced anew in 1103, no doubt because the truce had expired, and that several battles were fought as we learn from the Irish annals. But as to the conquests in Ulster, it is far from any such thing having taken place as on the

[1] The Saga of the holy bishop John of Hólar in Iceland, Biskupa Sögur I. 227. Here the following curious story is told: With the hostages there was a Norwegian, who boasted of being well versed in the Irish language, and offered to salute King Muircertach in the name of the others, which being allowed, he said „*male diarik*“, which, however, means „damned be thou, o King!“ Then another of the Norwegians put in his word, saying: My Lord, this man is only the slave of the Norwegians; to which the King replied *algeira ragall*, which means „difficult to know is the dark riddle“ (*gáta*) or „road“ (*gata*). Those of our readers, who are acquainted with the Irish language, may perhaps be able to suggest the correct forms of the Irish words here reproduced no doubt in a very bad shape.

[2] This name, more correctly spelled *Ceann Caraidh*, has been confounded by the author of the Saga with Connaught, *Kankaraborg* or *Kankarar* having evidently been misread as *Kunnaktaborg*, *Kunnaktir*.

contrary Muircertach and his allies were the losing party. The Irish annals say, that Muircertach, having encamped with his army, consisting of the men from Munster, Leinster, Ossory, Meath, and Connaught, on the plains of Cobha (in the north part of Downshire), he divided his forces, going with one part to Dalaraide (the district on the coast south-east of Loughneagh), leaving the rest at Cobha, where during his absence it was attacked and completely routed by Donald O'Lochlan on the 5th of August. Among the number of the killed there were also, according to the Irish annals, „foreigners from Dublin", three of whom are expressly named, viz. „Thorstain mac Eric", „Poll mac Amaind", and „Beollan armuinn", the two former, at least being entirely Scandinavian (Thorstein Ericson and Paul Amundson); maybe these „foreigners" were Norwegians from the army of Magnus, although it is to be supposed that the Norwegian king with his main force was on board his fleet, ravaging the coasts, while Muircertach made war on land, and that the diversion of the latter to Dalaraide was effected in order to meet and operate in conjunction with Magnus. In every case it is evident, that the defeat at Cobha put an end to the operations, as it is expressly stated in the Saga, that the expedition to Ulster having been ended, Muircertach returned to Kinkora, and Magnus prepared to go home; these preparations, however, must have taken place immediately after the battle at Cobha, as the fall of Magnus occurred only 19 days afterwards on the St. Bartholomew's day. This catastrophe is said by Ordericus to have been caused by the treachery of the Irish, who induced him to leave the ships and hazard himself with a small force into the interior of the country, making him believe that they intended to offer their submission, but afterwards suddenly attacking him with immensely superior numbers. This seems very probable in itself, but it ought to be remembered, that the Saga, founded upon traditions from the men who were present at the battle themselves, does not give the least hint of anything like treachery on the part of Muircertach, Magnus, it is said, wanting meat for the support of his army, dispatched men to Muircertach, requesting him to furnish the nessessary number of cattle; which request having been complied with, but the march of the cattle taking longer time than expected, Magnus, growing impatient, went imprudently too far up in the country to see if they did

not appear, and was attacked by the Irish. If, at this time, Muircertach had already returned to Kinkora, it seems not likely that Magnus should have sent his men so far; probably, however, Muircertach had not yet left the neighbourhood of Dalaraide, and in this case could not comply otherwise with the request, than compelling the inhabitants, or helping the Norwegian emissaries in compelling them to yield up the prescribed number of cattle, a measure, by which the Ulstonians would no doubt feel greatly exasperated, and become eager for revenge, without any instigation from Muircertach, or concerting of treacherous measures with him. Indeed, the annals of Ulster, where the particulars must have been well known, say only that Magnus was attacked and killed by the Ulstonians on a plundering expedition. The particulars of the battle are most circumstantially and forcibly told in the Saga, which however, does not mention, what is only told in the Chronicle of Man, that the body of the king was buried at St. Patrick's Church in Down. Maybe his relics may still be found there. It is evident that he was buried by the Irish, not by his own men, who were obliged to leave the body on the battle-field, and that this must have been in the neighbourhood of Down, his fleet probably still lying on the same spot where it was when the battle was fought at Cobha. At the death of Magnus, his men abandoned all newly acquired possessions in the West, and hastened homewards, taking with them prince Sigurd, who left his bride, the daughter of Muircertach, saying, according to the Saga, that all lords in the West, Scotch as well as Irish were odious to him. This certainly might be construed as indicating that Sigurd himself suspected the Irish of treachery against his father, yet such an interpretation of the words is by no means necessary. After all, however, Muircertach turned out to be really a traitor; immediately after the fall of Magnus, he courted very submissively the friendship of the English King, took his daughter back from Arnulf, and gave her to another man; nay, he planned even schemes against his life, which also, perhaps, Arnulf might have lost, if he had not been prevented in time, and made his escape to Normandy [1].

The author of our Chronicle, in assigning six years to the reign of Magnus in the Isles, must needs have meant to begin it with the

[1] William of Malmesbury, V. 409. cfr. Ordericus.

year of his second expedition, viz. 1098, which being the first, 1103 will be the last. So badly, however, the numbers of the years are added, that the accession of Olaf, son of Godred Crowan, is said to have taken place in 1102, although it is expressly stated, that Olaf was not made king till after the death of Magnus. That Magnus was killed in 1103, is certain enough, and corroborated by many authorities, especially that of Ordericus Vitalis [1].

p. 7. *Olavus filius Godredi . . . xl.ta annis*]. That the year, in which the reign of Olaf commenced, was 1103, and not 1102, is already shown. Likewise it is a mistake, arising from the careless way in which the ciphers of the years are added, that Olaf is said to have reigned forty years only, he was not killed in 1142 or 1143, as it is said afterwards in the chronicle (and which certainly gives a period of 40 years from 1102 or 1103), but in 1153, the chronicle itself stating expressly, that it was the same year, in which St. Bernard of Clairvaux and King David of Scotland died, viz. 1153 [2]. This is rather a remarkable instance of the author having been misled by his own inaccuracy. Olaf is mentioned also in the Orkneyinga Saga, with the curious surname of *Bitlingr* (the little bit), the cause of which appellation is not explained [3]. That Olaf did homage to the Norwegian kings is nowhere mentioned. He may have done it for all we know of it, but it seems more likely, that during his long reign the connexion with Norway was rather loose, it being expressly stated, as we see, that he kept so close a confederacy with the kings of Scotland and Ireland, that nobody dared to disturb his reign as long as he lived [4].

Habuit et concubinas plures &c.] Among these concubines, as they are styled here, one, however, seems to have been his legitimate second wife, viz. *Ingibjörg* daughter of Hácon, Earl of Orkney, and sister to Harold, Earl of Orkney, as well as to Margaret, the wife of Madadh

[1] Even in the Saga, the year is clearly enough indicated, as the king is said to have been killed on a monday, being also the day of St. Bartholomew. This exactly agrees with the year 1103 p. C.

[2] Vid. Chronica de Mailros, and others.

[3] a *varians lectio* gives the form *klíningr*, i. e. „bread and butter“.

[4] Towards the close of his reign, however, his son and future successor Godred, as we see, found it necessary to go to Norway and offer his homage to King Inge.

Earl of Athole [1]. The Orkn. Saga states expressly, that Ingibjörg was married to King Olaf, and indeed, it is not to be supposed, that a lady of such illustrious birth and connexions should degrade herself as to become a concubine even of a king. Ingibjörg, however, being born after the death of King Magnus and the firm establishment of her father in the Orkneys, that is to say about 1105—10, cannot have been married till about 1125, while the marriage of King Olaf with Afreca of Galloway no doubt took place shortly after the accession of Olaf to the throne.

Sumerledo regulo Herergaidel]. This *Sumarliði* or *Somerled*, the celebrated ruler of Argyll, who is also mentioned in Orkn. Saga, and in the Saga of King Hácon Háconsson as the founder of his dynasty, is styled King or „petty King" only in this Chronicle and the Irish annals. The Sagas do not mention his father, but from a genealogy, preserved, it would seem, among his descendants, the Mac Donalds, and printed in Johnstone's Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ, p. 152, we learn, that he was son of Gilbrigid, and grandson of Gil-Adomnan. Skene (Highlanders in Scotl. v. II. p. 40, 41) informs us from two curious old Gaelic MSS., that Gil-Adomnan was driven out from his possessions in Scotland by the violence of the Lochlans and Fingalls (i. e. the Norwegians), and took refuge in Ireland, and that Gillebridd, as it would appear, made an unsuccessful attempt to recover his paternal lands, which, however, was at last effected by Somerled, who „put himself at the head of the inhabitants of Morven, and by a series of rapid attacks succeeded, after considerable struggle, in expelling the Norwegians, and making himself master of the whole of Morven, Lochaber, and north Argyll", to which he soon afterwards added the southern district of Argyll. Perhaps we may be able to carry the genealogy still farther up than to Gil-Adomnan. In the annals of the Four Masters it is stated, that „Somerled, Son of Gilbrigid, King of Innsie Gall" (i. e. the Sudreys) died in 1083. It seems evident from the repetition of the personal names, that this Somerled was the father of Gil-Adomnan, and that, being originally and properly Lord of Argyll, he had also acquired some of the adjacent isles, as Jura, Mull &c., enough to procure him the title of insular King. We might even be inclined to think that Gil-Adomnan, being, as we presume, his son, was expelled his domini-

[1] Orkn. Saga p. 138.

ons by Godred of Man, not, as Mr. Skene suggests, by Magnus of Norway, who already found Godred and Lagman fully etablished in the Isles. Indeed, the chief family possessions of Godred being, as demonstrated above, the Island of Isla, which is next to Jura and Argyll, we may guess, that not only in the earlier years of Godred, before he conquered Man, but even in the times of their respective ancestors, there existed constant feuds between both families, such as generally used to rage among neighbouring clans in those days, and that the expulsion of Gil-Adomnan to Ireland was only a continuation of ancient conflicts. Seeing farther, that the Norwegian name of Somerled, which appears twice in the dynasty, indicates some connexion with Norwegian families and that the powerful Earl Sigurd, the father of Thorfinn, had really a son — his first-born — named Somerled, while the husband of his sister, the Sudreyan Earl, is called „Gille" (i. e. Gilbrigid, Gilchrist, Giladomnan or another similar name), we find it rather likely, that Somerled the elder was a descendant of Earl „Gille" by the sister of Earl Sigurd, and that his name as well as that of Earl Sigurd's son, was derived from the same common ancestor; nay, it is even probable that Somerled of the Isles, who seems to have been born about 1020, was immediately named after the Orkneyan Earl, who died about that time.

Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Sauiniensis —] This is the Cistercian Abbey of Savigny in Normandy, from which that of Furness, the mother of Russin Abbey at Man, was deducted. Even before the erection of Furness and Russin the monks of Savigny in Normandy seem to have had the right of furnishing Man with bishops, which right was subsequently translated, first to Furness, and then to Russin. We learn from Stubbs, *Acta Archiep. Eboracen.* p. 1217 as well as from Matth. Paris. (p. 60) and Chron. Nordmann. in the Collection of Duchesne p. 986, that some years before 1114, Wimund, monk of Savigny, and at the same time priest in the Isle of Skye, was ordained bishop of Man by Archbishop Thomas of York, and that, when he went away (we shall see afterwards that he became a pretender to the Scottish crown), John, a monk from the diocese of Seez (probably from the abbey of Savigny) became his successor, being, in his turn, again succeeded by Nicolas, monk from Furness, as we learn from the two letters directed

by King Olaf to Archbishop Thurstan of York, preserved in the „White Book“ at York, and printed in Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum* [1].

[1] See Dugdale, last edition, T. VIII. 1186. We give the letters here *in extenso*, as being of great interest to our present purpose. It seems to be only a mistake of the copyist, or perhaps the editor, that in the Superscription Nicolas is called bishop of Whitern (Candidæ Casæ) or Galloway.

„O. dei gratia rex Insularum, T. eadem gratia Eborum archiepiscopo salutem et orationes in Christo. Fama sanctitatis vestræ orbem terrarum circumquaque pertingens, quam a majorum nostrorum insigne præconium et virtus vestra tum privatis tum publicis actibus illustris in abscondito latere non sunt; nos quoque non parum lætificavit: collaudamus igitur Regis omnipotentis magnalia, gratias agentes ei, quia magnificavit dominus facere nobiscum, qui nos super omnes vicinos nostros dignitate atque sanctitate exaltavit: de cætero significamus vobis, quod dominus abbas Furnesciensis cœnobii, a cujus finibus non longe per mare distamus, audientibus nobis famam religionis ejusdem loci tripartita petitione, persuasioneque nostra itur . . . . . . arduum cum confidentia ingressus, compensatio itaque et itinerandi onere laborioso, et labore super ecclesia dilatanda fructuoso, Domino aspirante, ad nos usque pervenit, denique et nostro decreto et plebis consultu sancitum est inter nos, ut ex suis pontifex eligatur, qui Christianitati per insulas gentium propagandæ præficeretur. Quapropter ad vos conclamamus, vestræqué benignitatis gratiam humiliter imploramus, quatenus imponere manuum vestrarum ratum fiat de communi diligentia tam provide procuratum est fieri, ad honorem Dei, et salutem animarum nostrarum; scilicet, ut episcopus noster ad episcopo gradum, sub auctoritatis vestræ signaculo, pro Dei amore et nostri, quam citius fieri potest permoveatur, narrante nobis igitur domino abbate tam mira, tamque sancta de vobis; dicenteque se nolle nec posse ad alium quempiam ire, nisi ad vos patrem suum. Gaudio magno repleti pro universis, gratias Deo nostro prout potuimus, persolvimus. Valeat sanctitas vestra in Domino.“

„Venerabali venerabilis et sanctæ Eborum ecclesiæ decano, totique sancto fratrum conventui, Olavus dei gratia Insularum rex. Quicquid contrarium malo præter quidem, et fraternæ dilectionis affectum fraternitatis vestræ scripta diligenter intelligentes, quæ in eis continebatur animadvertimus, et de ordinum communione et consortii vestri servicio, et si gracias quas debemus solvere non possumus, tamen quas possumus incessanter solvere curamus: in omni ergo caritatis sollicitudine ad honorem Dei et matris nostræ ecclesiæ dignitatem quam diminutione sicut rem nequaquam debetis acc . . . . . pensate, qualiter Nicholaum electum nostrum archiepiscopi vestri per manuum impositionem consecratum, omni occasione et dilatione remota, ad nos mit-

Fund. — Furnes.] This is the abbey of Furness in the diocese of York, mother to that of Russin.

Fund. — Riuallis.] This entry is taken from the Chronica de Mailros, but wrongly assigned to the year 1133, while the latter expressly states, that the Abbey of Rivaux was founded in 1132 on a Saturday, which was also the III. non. Martii. The eclipse, however, the mention of which is likewise verbotenus adopted from the Chron. de Mailros happened really on Wednesday the 2th August, vid. l'Art de vérifier les dates [1]. The monastery of Mailros was a daughter of Rivaux, thence the entry about the latter.

Eodem anno — — Russin] There can be no doubt, that among the privileges granted to the abbey of Russin was also that of furnishing bishops to the See of Man, although, as we shall see presently, this privilege was not compatible with the right asserted by the clergy and people of Man, to elect the bishops themselves. When the Sudreys became a suffragan diocese under the metropolis of Nidaros in Norway, the same privilege became even a matter of dispute between the Archbishops of Nidaros on one side, and those of York with the monks of Furness and Russin, on the other.

p. 8. *Fundata est Abb. S. M. de Malros &c.*] The year, here given for both entries, that about the erection of the monastery and the other about the battle of the Standard (i. e. of Northallerton) are both wrong.

tere laboretis. Alioquin, quod absit, mutua dilectionis devotio spiritualis, quam promisimus ad vos exaltandum, sub termino mixti cleri et populi nostri decretum, absque spe reparandi, in æternum peribit. Furentium vero clamor sive injusta queremonia nos nullatenus disturbent qui . . . . . quod inter nos habere videntur quod non c . . . . secundum dominum vel homines potius . . . . quam aliud consequitur nuncios vero nostros qui nichil aliud vobis quam per nos audierint intimabunt, honorifice recipite, receptos cum episcopo nostro sine dilatione nobis remittite. Valete."

The year is wanting, as in most of such ancient letters, but the mention of Furness only in the former, not of Russin, shows that they are written before the erection of this monastery, probably about 1130; Thurstan was consecrated Archbishop in 1119.

[1] Here, the text of the Chron. de M. can be corrected by our Chronicle, having the word „feria", which is omitted in the former, between „Augusti" and „iiij."

The Abbey of Melrose was founded on the Easter Monday 1136, and the battle at Northallerton was fought on the 22d of August, 1138.

Ob. S. Malachias.] This is likewise wrong: St. Malachy died A. C. 1148, vid. Chron. de Mailros, and his biography in the works of St. Bernard, ed. 1690, I. 657.

Fund. est abbatia S. M. de Holm Coltran.] Again the number of the year (1141) is wrong, the entry being taken from Chron. de Mailres, where the erection of the monastery of Holmcultran (in Cumberland) is mentioned to have taken place on the 1st of January, 1150.

Godredus filius Olavi transfretavit.] That the year assigned to the death of King Olaf ought to be 1153, not 1142, is already shown above and needs no further demonstration. Very likely, however, 1152 was the year in which Godred went to Norway, and 1153 that of his return, as there are two years expressly mentioned in the Chronicle, although indeed the death of King Olaf is recorded in both. Moreover, the fact, that in the bull of 28 Nov. 1154, by which Pope Anastasius IV, few days before his death, at the suggestion of Nicolas Brekspere, Cardinal-bishop of Albano, erected the metropolitan See of Nidaros in Norway, the bishopric of the Sudreys is expressly named as one of its suffragans, puts it beyond doubt, that the homage of Godred to King Inge must have been made immediately before, or during the stay of the aforesaid Cardinal in Norway, from the 20th of July till about September 1152, when the previous arrangements as to the erection of the See were made, it being rather unlikely, that Man and the Sudreys, whose King so lately, as we have seen, had acknowledged the right of the Archbishop of York to consecrate the bishop thereof, could have been assigned to the province of Nidaros, unless upon such a palpable evidence of their allegiance to Norway, as afforded by the personal presence and homage of Godred. What might have been the reasons, which compelled Olaf, no doubt reluctantly, to send his son to Norway, and acknowledge the suzerainty of King Inge (here called Hinge) is difficult, to say. Most likely it was the troubles caused by the above mentioned Ex-bishop Wimund, in which also Somerled of Argyll took an active part. The pretensions to the Scottish crown, asserted by the Moray dynasty, were inherited from Lulach by Angus Mac Heth, son of his daughter, and Earl of Moray, who rebelled against King David, but was killed

in the battle of Strickathron 1130 [1]. Shortly afterwards, however, bishop Wimund declared himself to be the son of Angus, with the real name of Malcolm Mac Heth, assumed the title of Earl of Moray, and demanded even the crown of Scotland [2]. He found a great many followers, and, indeed, his pretensions seem to have been rather well founded; in the Orkn. Saga he is downright called „Malcolm Earl of Moray", without the least hint as to his being an impostor. The Melrose annals style him „Malcolm Mac Heth" [3]. Somerled of Argyll gave him his daughter in marriage, and subsequently the powerful Earl of Orkney, Harold, married his daughter. Assisted by Somerled, he ravaged for a time the western shores of Scotland, until King David succeeded in capturing and confining him in the castle of Roxburgh (1134). His sons, however, fled for refuge to Somerled, who revived the war after the death of David (1153). Meanwhile David seems to have taken his revenge with a strong hand; it is even said, we do not know upon what authority, that about 1135 he conquered the islands of Man, Arran and Bute, which however cannot be right as far as regards Man, the fact being not mentioned in the chronicle; so far, however, we may perhaps infer, that David threatened Man, so that Olaf found it advisable to put himself and his kingdom under the protection of the Norwegian kings. At the same time the powerful Welsh prince, Cadwallader, who in 1142 was engaged in a fierce war with his brother, Owen Gwynedd of Monmouth, seems to have infested Man, for while Caradoc tells, that he raised a great force of warriors from Ireland and Scotland (i. e. the Sudreys), the Orkneyinga Saga records, that „a Welsh chieftain" made great ravages in the Sudreys and Man, killing a wealthy and powerful lord, whose widow married the celebrated Orkneyan hero Svein Asleifsson. All these troubles, perhaps even apprehensions from the sons of his brother Harold, might have determined Olaf to acknowledge at last a suzerainty, which he seems to have disclaimed for the greater part of his life.

p. 9. *Coepit regnare Godredus.*] From what is already remarked, it will be easily seen that the year 1144 is to be corrected into 1154. The Chronicle itself assigns to Godred's reign the length of 33 years,

[1] Chron. de Mailros — Fordun V. 42. VIII. 2.

[2] Fordun, V. 51. cfr. VIII. 2. 59. William of Newbury I. 23. 24.

[3] Chr. d. Mailros — a. 1134. Orkn. S. p. 404.

and mentions afterwards, rightly, his death in 1187. The events in Dublin here narrated are not alluded to in the Irish annals, and as it is clearly indicated, that Godred did not feel himself firmly seated on the throne, or exhibit any tyrannical tendencies, until after his return from Ireland; while the first naval battle which occurred afterwards with Somerled in the war caused by his tyranny, is stated to have been fought in 1156, it is evident that his war in Ireland cannot have taken place in the third year of his reign, as the Chronicle has it, unless this third year is to be reckoned from his homage to the Norwegian king in the year 1152.

p. 10. *Commissum est navale prœlium &c.*] To understand these affairs thoroughly, we subjoin the following *exposé*. Malcolm Mac Heth being, as we have told above, taken prisoner in 1134, and confined in the castle of Roxburgh, where also his son Donald was put in 1156, he was, nevertheless, released by King Malcolm, who even ceded to him some possessions in Cumberland, evidently fearing his father-in-law, the powerful Somerled. Malcolm Mac Heth, however, exercised such a tyranny towards his subjects, that they revolted, took him prisoner, put his eyes out, besides inflicted other mutilations, and confined him in the monastery of Bellaland in Yorkshire, compelling him to resume the cowl. Nevertheless Somerled continued to make war against the Scottish king, as well as against Godred, who consequently, having enemies in common with the former, could not avoid coming in friendly relations to him. Immediately, therefore, after his flight from Man, we find him at the court of King Malcolm, where he witnessed the confutation of a document, in 1159 (Anderson Dipl. Scot. No. 25); in the next year we find him at the court of King Inge in Norway, who seems to have confirmed him in his royal rights, as it is said in the Icelandic annals, that in 1160 he got the title of King of the Sudreys. During his stay with King Inge he took a conspicuous part in the battle upon the ice near Oslo on the 4th of February, 1164, where Inge was killed; he commanded even a wing of Inge's army, but declared treacherously for the enemy, King Hácon, and thereby might be said to have been the chief cause of Inge's death. His treason, however, did certainly not bring him the expected fruits, because King Hácon, who no doubt had promised him his assistance, was slain by the partizans of the deceased King already

the following year, and the victorious party came again in power under their new King, Magnus Erlingsson. This party, however, either could or would not give Godred any assistance, at least not till 1164, when Magnus, being more firmly established on the throne, and crowned (in the Month of September) had probably taken Godred into grace and received his homage, for till this time it appears that Godred remained in Norway, abandoning his reign entirely to Somerled, nor is it likely, that he had returned even then, if he had not received the welcome news that Somerled was killed in the battle at Renfrew. The division which is said to have been made in 1156 between Godred and Somerled, and to have caused the ruin of the kingdom, ought perhaps more properly to be said to have been effected between Godred and Dubhgal or Dugald, the son of Somerled. The islands, allotted to Dugald through this division, were no doubt those, which lay nearer to Argyll and of which, indeed, we find afterwards the descendants of Dugald in possession.

Eodem tempore &c.] The Saint, here called Machutus, is now generally called St. Manghold or Magharde; even in the legend here narrated he is once called Machaldus.

p. 12. *Sumerledus — Rinfrui.*] The same tale is told by Fordun and in the Chronica de Mailros, so that there cannot be any doubt of its being true, although Orkn. Saga makes Swein Asleifsson kill Somerled already in 1159. This, however, must be a complete mistake. Fordun even adds the day, on which the battle took place viz. the 1st of January, and the name of his son, Gillecolum. The entry in our Chronicle is an abridgement from that in Chr. the Mailros, where it is expressly stated, that Somerled had rebelled against king Malcolm for 12 years. By a mistake, however, the death of King Malcolm is mentioned in the same year; Malcolm died in 1165 (Dec. 9) — and perhaps this number ought to be inserted before „eodem anno.“ Likewise the entry about the two comets, taken from Chron. de Mailros, belongs to a. d. 1165, not to 1166.

Whence Godred got the „*magna multitudo armatorum*,“ which he brought from Norway in 1164, is difficult to say. It is not likely that King Magnus, or rather the father and governor of King Magnus, Erling Skakke, would or could afford to give him much. But the rebellion of „Sigurd Markusfóstri“ was just put down in Norway, and his troop,

consisting chiefly of wild and reckless warriors from the southern borders of Norway, was without employment. Maybe Godred engaged some of these fellows. It is even probable that this was the occasion which brought the Husbac or Uspak (grandson of Somerled) mentioned p. 20, to Norway, it being evident, that in the year 1230, when he was sent to the Sudreys as King, he was very old, while the circumstance of his real birth being for so long time unknown or concealed, shows that he must have been carried away from the Isles while yet a child, no doubt by some of the above mentioned warriors, when they went back to Norway, where they must be supposed all of them, who returned, to have joined the party of the Birkebeins, to which Uspak is expressly stated to have belonged.

p. 13. *Anno 1171. Henricus rex &c.*] The year is wrong, being 1170, as in the Chronicle of Melrose, of which this entry is taken. Our text, however, is in so far more correct than that of the M. Chronicle, as it does not make the coronation day of Young Henry the same as the consecration day, which is the case in Chr. de Melrose, where the words run thus. „*Henricus rex Angliæ fecit coronari Henricum puerum, et in regem apud Lundonias, xi. kalendas Junii in die dominica consecrari a Rogero &c.*" In 1170, the 22th of May was not a Sunday, but a Friday.

p. 13. *Vivianus &c.*] This Vivian, Cardinal-priest of St. Stephanus in Monte Coelio, is mentioned in several Chronicles. The Chron. of Melrose mentions his arrival in Scotland in the year 1176, saying of him „conculcans et comminuens omnia quæque, expeditus capere nec impeditus rapere" —, and states, that returning from Ireland in 1177, he held a council of the Scotch Prelates at Edinburgh. See moreover Roger Hoveden (Savile p. 553) and Bromton (Twysden p. 110), where it is expressly stated, that he was sent to visit not only Scotland, Ireland, and the Isles, but also Norway, to which country, however, he never came. Bromton says, that he landed in England the 22th of June 1176 without the consent of the King, who therefore would not allow him to go farther, till he had sworn, not to do anything against him; having complied with the request, he got letters of safe conduct to Scotland, whence, about Christmas, he visited Man where he staid a fortnight, continuing his journey to Ireland, where he encouraged the Inhabitants of Downshire to hold out against John de Conray. After-

wards therefore as punishment he was put into prison by John, but released after a short while, held a council at Dublin, and returned to Scotland, where he is said to have created so great disgust by his avarice, that the Pope was obliged to recall him.

p. 14. *Anno m°c°lxx°ij°.*] Again the number of the year is wrong, this being evidently 1182. Neither the Reginald here spoken of, nor the „Fogolt" *Vicecomes Manniæ* named in the next entry, are mentioned anywhere else. This is the first time that the title „*Vice-Comes*" does occur in the chronicle, and it is very uncertain, what the Norwegian term was for this denomination. In 1223 a „*vicecomes de Sky*" is mentioned, whence it would seem, that each of the greater islands had a „*Vicecomes*" or governor. Very likely the title existed since the times of Earls Sigurd and Thorfinn of Orkney, when the Isles were subjected to these Earls, and their substitutes who commanded in their names, really did so „vice Comitum." In the times, however, of King Godred, the substitute governors ought rather to be called viceroys. Perhaps the Norwegians only called these functionaries *sýslumenn* (which in Latin is always rendered by *ballivi*).

p. 14. *Olavi — utpote decennis pueri.*] As it is expressly stated, that Olaf was three years old in 1176, when the solemn wedding took place between his father and mother, he must have attained his 14th, not only his 10th year, at his father's death. From the supplementary narrative p. 16 we learn, that Reginald, if not immediately at his accession, at least some time afterwards assigned to Olaf the island of Lewis for maintenance. Very likely he gave him in exchange for the royal power the same appanage or fief, which he had himself hitherto obtained. In the icelandic Saga of the celebrated chief and physician Rafn Sveinbiarnarson it is told rather at length, how this Rafn and the bishop elect Gudmund, sailing from Iceland towards Norway in the year 1202, were driven by storms to Sandey, one of the Sudreys, where they just found King Olaf and the Bishop, and were compelled by the former to pay a tax, at first calculated to 50 Marks, but afterwards, as the Icelanders showed fight, abated to 15 Marks.[1] Sandey being no doubt Sandera, one of the southernmost of the long series of Islands called Long Island, beginning with Lewis, it is evident that Olaf did not get

¹) Saga Hrafns Sveinbjarnarsonar, Biskupa Sögur, Copenhagen, 1858. P. 563-564.

this island only, but even the others, North-Uist, Harris, South-Uist, Benbecula &c. — down to the southernmost point. Reginald, the elder brother, was, according to the Orkn. Saga, regarded as one of the most warlike princes in the western parts of Europe at his time; once, it is stated, he passed three entire successive years in the manner of the ancient Sea-kings, always on board his ship, never during the whole period for one single hour living beneath the roof of a house. Our chronicle entirely omits his participation in the Orkneyan affairs, which however is spoken of by Roger Hoveden under the year 1196, and the whole narrative of Hoveden of these events, is again copied by the writer of our Chronicle in a separate article inserted in the same book[1]. It is to be observed, that Hoveden mentions under one year, what really took place in three or four. We shall here briefly enumerate the events in the connexion which appear to be just, after duly comparing the Orkn. Saga, the Melrose Chronicle and Fordun[2]. The powerful Orkneyan Earl Harold, Son of Madadh Earl of Atholl, had for a long period been on bad terms with King William of Scotland. It is very probable, that Harold was one of the six Earls, who rebelled against King Malcolm in 1160 in order to place William of Egremont, grandson of Duncan, on the throne, and that he also supported the son of William, Donald Bane, who aspired to the throne, and from 1180—1187 maintained himself in Moray and Ross, till he was killed in the battle of Macgarvey (July 31. 1187). It is expressly stated, that Harold was instigated to hostilities against the Scottish King by his second wife Hoarflad (Gormlath), daughter of the above mentioned Malcolm Mac Heth, Earl of Moray, *alias* bishop Wimund. When therefore a rival to the Earldoms of Orkney and Caithness appeared in the person of Harold the younger, (grandson by a daughter of Earl Ragnvald), who had got the title of Earl from the Norwegian King about 1175, King William embraced his interests, and gave him the half of Caithness which, of course, he must

¹) See Johnstone's *Antiquitates Celtonormannicæ*, p. 49 Sqq. where it is printed.

²) We deem it superfluous here to enter into a minute *compte rendu* of all the reasons which have induced us now in giving one, now anothor author the preference, when conflicting with each other. Indeed, the reasons present them of themselves. Those, however, who want to see them scrupulously explained, we refer to our work „The History of the Norwegian People," Vol. 3. pp. 41, 289, 443—454.

have taken from Harold the elder, and although it is not said expressly, yet we may safely infer, that from this time incessant or frequent feuds raged between the two rivals. Harold the elder being a staunch partizan of the Norwegian king Magnus, who was supplanted and at last killed in battle by the celebrated *Sverrir* (1184), it is evident that Harold the younger must have looked for support to the latter, and declared for him, and this was no doubt the principal reason, why Harold the elder in 1193 permitted the enemies of Sverrir to collect troops and ships in his dominions, and even afforded them considerable support. This force made great mischief in Norway, but was at last totally vanquished by Sverrir in a bloody battle near Bergen (Apr. 3. 1194) And now, Earl Harold was severely punished. He was summoned to Norway, and there compelled to submit to the terms dictated by King Sverrir, who entirely detached Shetland from the Earldom, annexing it to the Crown, and moreover appropriated to himself a great part of the revenues of Orkney. It would even seem, that Sverrir, if not immediately, yet shortly afterwards, assigned to his rival the half of Orkney due to him as the grandson and heir of Earl Ragnvald. Yet though humiliated in this manner, and stripped of a great part of his dominions Harold the elder nevertheless, according to Hoveden, dared to occupy Moray, or perhaps rather to keep it in his possession, the occupation having likely taken place before 1195. Profiting, it would seem, from his present distress, King William made an expedition to Moray, nor did Harold venture to resist him, but fled to his ships, while King William penetrated as far as Thurso in Caithness, where he destroyed the Earl's palace. Harold, prevented by storms from crossing over to Orkney, felt compelled to submit to King William as he had submitted to King Sverrir, but he obtained his forgiveness, and was even permitted to retain the half of Caithness, by promising upon oath, that next time, when the King came to Moray, he should deliver up to him all his enemies, no doubt the Mac Williams, and give his own son Thorfinn as hostage. As soon, however, as the King had returned, the peace was broken by Harold himself or his men, who penetrated as far as Inverness, before they were routed by the royal forces. King William now went back to the north, and overran Sutherland, Caithness, and Moray, while Harold, as it would seem, frightened, and professing

to be innocent of the doings of his son, met the King at Lochloy near Nairn, bringing the enemies, as stipulated, but for hostages only his two young nephews, not Thorfinn. And even before seeing the King he suffered the enemies to escape, apologising afterwards to the King in a manner which only tended to exasperate him the more. No wonder Harold was severely punished; the King declared him a felon and breaker of the treaty to have forfeited what he still held of Caithnes, carried him away as prisoner, and had him confined in the castle of Roxburgh, until his son Thorfinn might be delivered up. This was accordingly done, and Harold being exchanged for his son, returned to Orkney, where however he was soon visited with new troubles, as his rival, Harold the younger, just coming from Norway with some forces collected there, requested him to give up the half of Orkney, and, this being denied, attacked him so suddenly and fiercely, that he fled to Man, there to seek for help. Harold the younger, however, followed him, but did not find him at Man as he had already returned to Scotland, with some auxiliary forces. Harold the younger now also returned to Scotland, and waited for his rival at Wick. Nor did it last long before Harold the elder appeared, but with a force much larger than expected; a battle ensued, in which the younger Earl and his men were killed after having given proofs of the most heroical valour (1198). Harold the elder now recaptured Caithness, and as he could excuse himself of being this time the attacked party, he ventured even to repair to the court of King William, requesting to retain the possession of Caithnes for a large sum of money. The King showed himself not indisposed to grant the request, but demanded farther, that Harold should dismiss his wife, the daughter of Malcolm Mac Heath. With this condition, however, Harold could or would not comply, and the negotiations were broken off. King William now addressed himself to King Reginald of Man, offering him the earldom of Caithness for a certain sum of money, and payment of the regular tribute. Reginald accepted the offer, and collected troops, being also supplied with auxiliary forces from Ireland by his brother-in-law, John of Courcy; with this army he went to Caithness, and conquered it without any resistance on the part of Harold. In the beginning of the winter, however, he returned home, leaving three lieutenants to defend the conquest; but Harold, profiting by his absence, caused one of the lieutenants to be put to death by an

assassin, and shortly after landed himself at Thurso with a powerful fleet, with the intention to retake his ancestral patrimony. He began with attacking and storming the episcopal palace of Scrabustar (Skarabólstaðr) where bishop John af Caithness just happened to be; and considering this prelate as the principal instigator of the hostilities which he had encountered from the Scotch King, he took a most barbarous revenge ordering him to be blinded and his tongue to be cut out. This done, he made himself master of the whole of Caithness, severely punishing all adherents of King William, and seizing the possessions of those who fled to save themselves. The King of the Isles, it would seem, now entirely gave up the idea or lost the desire of becoming Lord of Caithness, as the above mentioned lieutenants did not betake themselves to him, but to King William, who henceforth sought revenge and punished the wanton earl in his own name. His first act was to let the unhappy Thorfinn, the Earl's son, who still remained as hostage, atone for the trespasses of his father: he was blinded and castrated, and shortly afterwards died in prison. In the spring of 1202, King William with a large force went to the North, and encamped at Esteyndale, which then formed the border between Sutherland and Caithness, preparing an expedition across the Petland firth to Orkney. The Earl, seeing the superior strength of his Suzerain, and despairing of success, again sued for peace, which he obtained, as well as the possession af Caithness, on the condition of paying every fourth penny found in the whole earldom, no doubt as an indemnification to King Reginald of Man, who had paid his money without getting the object. Harold, being unable to procure the money from his own means, induced the inhabitants of Caithness, who were anxious themselves to avoid the horrors of war, to pay what was wanted, and thus a sum of 2000 Marks in Silver was raised, with which the King was satisfied. Thus Earl Harold retained Caithness at the cost of the inhabitants, and it does not appear that King Reginald afterwards aspired to the possession of this remote district.[1]

[1] Fordun, I. p. 512. Roger Hoveden (ap. Savile) p. 767. Orkneyinga Saga p. 406—418. Sverr. Saga ch. 125. Fordun (VIII. 62) says that the mutilation of the bishop was not so thoroughly executed, as the Earl ordered, and that consequently the bishop retained the power of speaking and the sight of one eye. This is also more probable than the relation of Orkn. Saga, which says, that the bishop was really deprived of his tongue and sight, but got them

p. 16. *Fuitque Olavus catenatus in carcere regis Scotiæ fere septem annis &c.*] As King William died in 1214, Dec. 4, the time, when King Olaf was taken prisoner and sent to William, must have been in the course of the year 1208. It is, therefore, very likely, that an expedition, undertaken from Norway to the Isles in 1210, on which point our Chronicle is entirely silent, but of which the King's Saga and the Icelandic Annals speak, was partly prompted by the friends and adherents of Olaf, who had now only to look towards Norway for assistance and revenge, Scotland being the accomplice of Reginald. Again, however, the Norwegian and Icelandic relations make no mention at all of the treacherous conduct of King Reginald. The Saga only tells [1], that when the long civil war between the two political factions, the Birkibeins and the Beglings, was happily brought to an end through the treaty of Hvitingsey in the summer of 1208, several of the warriors on both sides, disgusted with the prospects of peace and tranquillity at home, determined jointly to make a privateering expedition to the Sudreys. The pretext they could or did give for thus attacking a dependency of Norway in the times of peace, is not told: we are therefore left to conjecture, and, indeed nothing is more probable than that the chief or pretended object was the chastisement of Reginald, and, if possible, the deliverance of Olaf. In the year 1209, according to the Annals, the preperations were made and twelve ships of war were armed. Among the chiefs four are expressly named as belonging to the party of the Beglings, and three as being Birkibeins; one of these was Uspak, the above mentioned grandson of Somerled, who perhaps intended to try, if he could regain some possessions in right of his descent, and who no doubt was the real director of the whole concern. In the year 1209, as we learn from the Ulster annals, the „Mac Somerleds", i. e. the sons of Reginald, son of Somerled, fought a battle with the men

both back by a miracle of Sta Triduana (in the Saga the Name is corrupted into *Trollhæna*) to whom he offered his prayers. In the letter directed by Pope Innocent III to the bishop of Orkney, (dat. Subiaco Sept. 1. 1202), in which he prescribes the penitence to be undergone by the man, who had executed the cruel commands of the Earl, there is only mention of the mutilation of the tongue, not of the eyes.

[1] Saga of K. Inge &c. Fornmanna Sögur IX. 192.

of Skye; this event also must somehow have been in connexion with the expedition from Norway, which, according to the Annals, took place in 1210, or perhaps began in the autumn of 1209, ending in 1210. In the Saga no more is told of the expedition, than that the Norwegians rifled Iona, which had till then been held sacred and left untouched; that afterwards they quarrelled with each other, and separated; that some of them were killed in different places, and that those who returned were reprimanded severely by the bishops for having conducted themselves like pirates. It is very singular, and almost inconceivable, that our Chronicle should not say a word of this expedition. It is, however, not unlikely, that the fact mentioned under the year 1210, viz. that Angus, the son of Somerled, being killed with his three sons, is connected therewith, and that he fell in a fight with the Norwegians under his nephew Uspak. It is also probable, that the Norwegians somehow took part in the devastation of Man by King John of England, of which our Chronicle speaks, as happening in the same year (1210). Although the Saga speaks of the expedition from Norway as being of no consequence, yet it seems, that it inspired Reginald with a wholesome awe of the Norwegians, which induced him shortly afterwards to repair to Norway with his son Godred, do homage to King Inge, swear the oath of allegiance, and pay the tribute hitherto withheld. Which all, however, did not prevent him from shortly afterwards, in 1212, doing homage even to King John of England (see his letter dated Lambeth, May 16. 1212, in Rymeri Foed. I. 1. p. 105), nevertheless suffering his subjects to commit depredations on the coasts of Ireland and England. But after the death of King John, when his son, King Henry III, was at last established on the throne, and his rival, Louis of France, had left the kingdom, Reginald applied for a safe conduct for the time from Jan. 16 to Easter 1218, that he might repair to King Henry, do him homage, and give satisfaction for the committed outrages. The letter was accorded (vid. Rymeri Foedera I. p. 150) yet it is not said, whether Reginald went then to London, or not. Certain it is, however, that he did so the following year, and then not only offered his services and homage to the King, but also, summoned by the apostolical legate and plenipotentiary Pandolfo, issued a declaration, dated Sept. 1. 1219, in which he professed to hold the Isle of

Man as a fief of the Papal See, promised to pay a yearly tribute of 12 marks Sterling, and acknowledged being invested by the Legate with the possession thereof. This curious document, which certainly was in open contradiction with his obligations to Norway, and therefore evidently shows, that he refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of the young Norwegian King Hácon (especially as it is expressly said in the document, that the Isle of Man did belong to himself with hereditary right and without any obligation of feudal service to anybody) — is not only preserved in the English archives, and printed in Rymeri Foedera I. 1. 156 [1], but from another copy, formerly existing in the papal archives, it has also been transcribed in the celebrated collection of documents recording the rights of the See, which was compiled by Cardinal Nicholas of Aragon, and from this compilation again it is given by Raynaldus in the *Annales Eccl. ad ann.* 1219. No. 44. Raynaldus gives also for the year 1223 (No. 53), a papal letter dated May 23, 1223 [2], in which the holy Father

[1] Sanctissimo patri et domino Honorio, dei gratia, summo Pontifici, Reginaldus Rex Insularum commendationem cum osculo pedum. Noverit sancta paternitas vestra, quod nos, ut participes simus bonorum quæ fiunt in ecclesia Romana, ad monitionem et exhortationem dilecti patris domini Pandulphi Norwicensis electi, camerarii et legati vestri, dedimus et obtulimus, nomine ecclesiæ Romanæ et vestro, et Catholicorum vestrorum successorum, Insulam nostram de Man, quæ ad nos jure hæreditario pertinet, et de qua nulli tenemur aliquod servitium facere; et deinceps nos et hæredes nostri in perpetuum tenebimus in feudum dictam insulam ab ecclesia Romana, et faciemus ei per hoc, homagium, et fidelitatem. Et, in recognitionem dominii, nomine census, nos et hæredes nostri, in perpetuum, annuatim solvemus ecclesiæ Romanæ duodecim marcas sterlingorum in Anglia apud abbatiam de Furnis Cisterciensis ordinis, in festo Purificationis beatæ Mariæ. Et si non esset ibi aliquis ex parte vestra, vel successorum vestrorum, deponentur dictæ duodecim marcæ per nos et hæredes nostros penes abbatem et conventum ecclesiæ Romanæ nomine. Hanc donationem et oblationem dictus dominus legatus recepit ad voluntatem et beneplacitum vestrum; et post receptionem factam ab eo, sic ipse dominus legatus dictam insulam dedit mihi et hæredibus meis in feudum perpetuo possidendam, et tenendam nomine ecclesiæ Romanæ, et me inde per annulum aureum investivit etc. Actum London' in domo Militiæ Templi XI. kal. Octob., anno domini millesimo ducenesimo decimo nono. Et ne super his aliquando possit dubitari, has literas fieri fecimus patentes, et sigillo nostro muniri.

[2] Sicut transmissæ nobis tuæ litteræ protestantur bonorum quæ fiunt in Ecclesia

accepts of the offer made by Reginald, and takes him and his realm into his protection. As for the homage of Reginald offered to the English King, it may be, however, that it was not meant for Man, but for some Irish fiefs, held by him on the condition to guard the coasts and seas against pirates and enemies, because on the 24th of Septbr. 1219, the King directed a letter to the Justitiary and Barons of Ireland for the protection of Reginald (Rymer I. 1. p. 157), and from letters, likewise given by Rymer, we learn, that such fiefs were really given to and accepted by his brother and successor Olaf, without in the least affecting his fidelity to the crown of Norway. This explains also best the above mentioned words in the Orney. Saga, that Reginald passed three years in the manner of the ancient pirates, not sleeping beneath the roof of a house.

P. 17. *Scristinam filiam Ferkkar Comitis de Ros*]. „*Scristinam*“ means „*Christinam*“, as p. 22 „Gillescrist“ is written instead of „Gillechrist.“ This „Ferkkar“ was the powerful Ferquhard Mac Intagart, Earl of Ross, whom the Chron. de Mailros calls „*Machentagar*“ only, narrating, that in the year 1215 „*intraverunt in Moraviam hostes domini regis Scotiæ, scilicet Dovenaldus Ban, filius Macwillelmi, et Kennauh Mac Aht, et filius cuiusdam regis Hiberniæ, cum turba malignantium copiosa; in quos irruens Machentagar hostes regis valide prostravit, quorum capita detruncavit et novo regi nova munera præsentavit, .xvij. kal. Julii, propter quod domnus rex novum militem ipsum ordinavit*“. — The „Macwilliam“ here mentioned must

Rom. particeps esse cupiens, ad exhortationem venerabilis fratris nostri P. Norwicensis episcopi tunc electi, et A. S. L. ei ecclesiæ Rom. nomine ac nostro, insulam de Man, quæ ad te jure hæreditario pertinebat, nullumque de ipsa servitium facere tenebaris, donasti liberaliter et irrevocabiliter tradidisti, recipiens eandem insulam ab Ecclesia Rom. in feudum, et pro ea nobis fidelitatis et homagii exhibens juramentum. In recognitionem quoque dominii Ecclesiæ Rom. tu et hæredes tui annuatim duodecim marchas sterlingorum in Anglia apud monasterium de Furnis in festo Purificationis B. Virginis persolvetis: quæ omnia jurasti te servaturum fideliter. Nos igitur habentes hæc rata et grata tuis supplicationibus inclinati, personam et terram tuam cum omnibus, quæ in præsentiarum rationabiliter possides, aut in futurum iustis modis, præstante domino, poteris adipisci, sub B. Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus, et præsentis scripti patrocinio communimus. Dat. Later. X. kal. Jun. pont. nostri anno VIII.

have been the son of Guthred Macwilliam (Son of William of Egremont, grandson of King Duncan and Ingibiörg the daughter of Finn Arneson), who had begun a rebellion in 1211, but in 1212 had been captured by William Cumyn, Earl of Buchan, and put to death (Fordun, VIII. 76). „Kennauh Mac .Aht" must mean „Kenneth Mac Heath", which shows him to have been son of the other pretender, Malcolm Mac Heth (alias Wimund), and brother-in-law of Earl Harold at Orkney.

P. 18. *Pol filius Boke*]. This is the *Páll Bálkason* thus named in the Saga of King Hácon, Ch. 166. His father's name *Bálki* was pronounced, it would seem, by the Sudreyans, as it would still be in many parts of Norway, with omission of the „l", or in a manner analogous with the English pronunciation of „walk", „talk", etc. By a curious mistake, Johnstone (p. 150) believes the *„princeps Paulus"* mentioned p. 10, about the year 1154, to be the same as Páll Bálkason, who must in that case have been 100 years or more of age, when he came to Norway in 1229.

P. 18. *Alano domino Galwediæ*]. This is the celebrated Alan of Galloway, Constable of Scotland and the most powerful of the Scotch Magnates, married to the King's cousin Margaret of Huntingdon, and possessing large fiefs in Ireland, which he held from King John of England. His brother Thomas, who had become Earl of Atholl through marriage, is mentioned in our Chronicle as *„Thomas Comes Etholice"* in the year 1228.

P. 19. *Recuperavit Olavus hæriditatem etc.*] It was probably in order to announce this important event to the Suzerain, King Hácon of Norway, that, as we learn from his Saga, bishop Simon of Sudrey and the Abbot of Iona went to Bergen in the summer of 1226, where even Earl John of Orkney appeared and where the King was to have an interview with Earl Skuli, his co-regent, and the Archbishop of Nidaros. (Hák. H. S. Ch. 147). The King, it is told, settled the affairs of the Sudreyan envoys, after a deliberation with Earl Skúli. It would seem that they had been sent on purpose by King Olaf. At the same occasion bishop Simon was no doubt consecrated by the Archbishop, as we know for certain that the consecration took place in 1226, and it is not likely that he went to Norway twice in one year.

P. 19. *Supervenit autem Olavus rex etc.*] Before this event, it ap-

pears that the English King tried to make peace between the brothers, as, on April 12, 1228, he directed a letter of safe conduct to Olaf and his men, for 15 days from Michaelmass in the same year, to repair to England, where peace was to be made between him and his brother [1]. There is, however, no trace of Olaf having accepted the offer of mediation; on the contrary, as it is told in our Chronicle, he returned to Man, expelled the bailiffs of Alan, and recaptured his kingdom.

P. 20. *Post hæc Olavus adiit etc.*] The arrival of King Olaf in Norway did not take place in 1229, as it would appear from our Chronicle, but according to the excellent and trustworthy Saga of King Hácon, in 1230, when the fleet, which the King intended to send to the Isles, was already equipped and ready to sail. The notice, however, of the events and revolutions in the Isles had already reached Norway in the summer of 1229. That summer, it is told in the Saga, reports of great warfare came from the Sudreys (Ch. 162). No doubt the unhappy son of Reginald, Godred Don, was one of the first to carry the news to Norway, as we learn from the Chronicle, that in 1229 (or rather 1230) he came from Norway, whither he probably fled immediately after his father's death, the powerful Alan of Galloway being just then unable to afford him any protection, as he was absent in Ireland with his best warriors, in order to marry a daughter of the powerful Hugh de Lacy, and in returning was shipwrecked with the loss of many of his men and danger of his own life [2]. Also Paul Balkason (Pol filius Boke) went to Norway, no doubt sent by King Olaf, to report the events to the King and the Earl, and to sue for their assistance against Alan. It would seem, however, that Paul committed the fault of befriending himself more with the Earl than with the King, which was the surest way to lose the trust of the latter, as already for many years there existed between them a rivalry, which ended in open war, and with the fall of Skúli. It is evident, although not expressly told, that either of compassion with Godred, or out of distrust to Paul and King Olaf, he recognized the claims of the former, and made a division of the kingdom between both, as we learn, that Olaf and Godred arrived together in the Norwegian fleet, and immediately divided the kingdom

[1] Rymeri Foedera. I. 1. p. 190.

[2] Fordun. IX. 47. Chronicle of Lanercost, ad ann. 1229.

between themselves. We learn, moreover, as well from the Saga as from the Chronicle, that also the above mentioned Uspak Agmundsson (Owmundi), now found to be really a son of Dugald, the son of Somerled, got a portion with the title of King and the new name of Hácon; yet the part assigned to him seems not to have been taken from the possessions of Olaf and Godred; Uspak as son of Dugald, belonged to the Somerled branch, and it is most probable, that the King assigned to him those islands, hitherto held by other members of the same, who had forfeited their right to them through want of fidelity. For it is expressly said in the Saga, that the Kings of the Somerled branch were not to be relied upon, nor was it to be expected, that when the greater part of their possessions were on the main land, they should not generally incline more to the part of the Scotch King than to the King of Norway; their main object, however, was to maintain their own freedom through balancing adroitly between both powers. Yet through all these movements we perceive easily the chief impulse of King Alexander, who, keenly feeling the inconvenience and danger of a foreign power, so strong at sea as Norway was then, extending her dominions almost to the heart of his own kingdom over lands naturally belonging thereto, strove incessantly to gain possession of the Islands, and at last resorted to open war. The movements of the Constable no doubt were greatly influenced by the King's directions. We learn from the Saga (Ch. 166) that Alan (of course when returned from Ireland), made great preparations for a new attack on King Olaf and the Norwegians, threatening even to cross over to Norway itself, „as it was no more difficult to go from Scotland to Norway, than vice versa, and there being no less facility of finding ports or shelter for a fleet there than in the firth of Scotland.“ Indeed, it was these threats, and the imminent danger, which compelled king Olaf to flee from Man to Norway, where he appeared unexpectedly when the fleet, as mentioned above, was about to leave. As for the Kings or Chiefs of the Somerled line, we learn, that about this period, two brothers, Duncan and Dugald Skrøk, sons of Dugald, the son of Somerled, now were the chief rulers in the Somerled part of the Isles, while their cousin Somerled, no doubt the son of Somerled's eldest son Gillecolum, who fell with his father in the battle at Renfrew 1164, had enjoyed the mainland possessions

of Argyll, but had been deprived of it in 1221 by King Alexander as a punishment for having taken the part of Gillescop Mac William, the last of this long line of pretenders. This, however, does not seem to have increased his fidelity to the Norwegian crown; indeed the politics of these Somerledian descendants was to form a balance between Scotland and Norway, always keeping on the side which promised to be the most advantageous to them. Therefore it may have been a wise forethought of King Hácon, to have them supplanted, or at least controlled by a man, on whose fidelity he could rely, and such a man was Uspak, the veteran royal warrior, whom he now promoted to the rank of King, moreover giving him his own name, which sounded more royally than Uspak [1]. The Saga of King Hácon (Ch. 165) relates, that this promotion took place at a „thing" or public meeting, which the King held in the City of Oslo in the spring of 1230, and where he proclaimed, that in the impending summer he would send him to the Sudreys with a sufficient force. According to our Chronicle, the expedition took place in the years 1229—30; the Saga, however, the correctness of whose chronology is beyond all doubt, places it in 1230—1231, and this is moreover confirmed by the Chronicle of Lanercost, and the Icelandic annals, which assign the arrival of Uspak-Hácon to the year 1230. The events of this expedition are related at large in the Saga, while the narrative of our Chronicle is very deficient. From Oslo, we learn, Hácon repaired to Bergen, in order to prepare the armament. The King furnished 8 ships, the Earl 3, the commander of one of these he named Paul Bálkason, a certain sign that this chieftain had sought the friendship of the Earl more than that of the King. The commanders named by Hácon appear all of them to have been his „hirðmenn" or sworn followers. When the armament was ready and the fleet about to sail, King Olaf, as stated above, came to Bergen unexpectedly, driven from Man by the threats of Earl Alan. His boast, however, that he

[1] The name *Úspakr* also written *Óspakr*, is properly an adjective, i. e. the word „*spakr*" (prudens, quietus) with the *ú* or *ó* privativum (the English) *un; Úspakr* consequently means „unruly", „fierce". Our Chronicle and that of Lanercost spell incorrectly „Husbac". It is evident, that before the detection of his real birth, he must have been believed to be the son of one *Ögmundr* or Agmund (*Owmundus*).

would make an expedition to Norway, was only announced, as the Saga says, but not executed; and indeed, it seems, that the troubles caused by the remnants of the Mac William party, which were crushed at last in 1230 [1], but not without difficulty, had greatly occupied him, as the Constable of Scotland, prevented his carrying out his menaces that year. Four days after the arrival of Olaf the fleet sailed, and he had nothing to do but to follow, in the ship commanded by Paul Bálkason. Previously, however, it must be supposed that King Hácon had effected a kind of reconciliation between him and Godred (whose presence in Norway is not mentioned in the Saga) and had already fixed the terms of the division, on which they afterwards agreed to; as it is not likely, that Olaf would have done this from his own good will. The fleet touched at Orkney, where it was reinforced by 9 ships, furnished, it seems, partly by Earl John, partly by the royal bailiffs; King Olaf now left Paul Bálkason's ship, and took the command of one furnished by Earl John. The fleet sailed first towards Isla-Sound, where the Kings Dugald and Duncan, as well as Somerled of Argyll lay with a considerable force. Meanwhile, however, Bálki son of Paul Bálkason, and another Sudreyan chieftain Ottar Snækollsson, went to Skye, where they attacked a chieftain, named in the Saga Thorkel Thormodsson (i. e. Torquill Mac Dermot), who fell with two of his sons; the third, Thormod (Dermot) escaping to Scotland; this achieved, they again joined the mainfleet. The cause of this diversion is not stated in the Saga; maybe it was only the carrying out a private feud between Paul and Torquill. The three Somerledian princes in Islasound, although they could not possibly be amicably disposed towards the Norwegians, whose aim it was to deprive them of their power and independency, did not dare to show fight, but professed friendly sentiments, and invited the Norwegian commanders to a feast, while one of them, Duncan, went on board the ship of Uspak-Hácon, no doubt as a kind of hostage. Nevertheles the Norwegians distrusted them, alleging that the Sudreyans only meant to intoxicate them with strong liquors, that they might safely attack them and easily kill them afterwards. They declined the invitation, and now both parts prepared for a battle. Uspak-Hácon, it seems, tried to avert open hostilities, but

[1] See the Chronicle of Lanercost, ad ann. 1230.

without his assent and knowledge the Norwegians made an attack, killed Somerled with many of his men, and captured Dugald. When Uspak-Hácon heard this, he suffered Duncan secretly to escape, and took Dugald, whom the Norwegians had put in irons, on board his own ship. This shows, not only that Uspak-Hácon must have been invested with the chief command of the expedition, but also, that he was a kind-hearted, loyal man, who meant to act as leniently as possible towards his brothers. More reinforcements now increased the fleet to 80 sail, with which the Norwegians sailed round Cantire to Bute [1], where the castle of Rothsay had got a Scotch garrison, as mentioned above. It was besieged and after three days taken by storm, after a spirited defence; the Norwegians lost 360 men, and, according to our Chronicle, as well as the Chronicle of Lanercost, King Uspak-Hácon was killed by a stone. From the Saga, however, which, strange to say, does not mention his being hurt, but only speaks of his subsequent sickness and death, it is evident, that his death did not follow immediately. The Scotch lost their commander, and the Norwegians got a large booty, together with the sum of 360 Marks of silver, which a Scotch knight, taken prisoner, paid for his ransom; but soon afterwards they had the misfortune, that three of the ships foundered in a storm. It being, moreover, announced that Earl Alan lay with 180 ships near the ness of Galloway, they sailed to the south of Cantire, where they remained for a while, making frequent hostile excursions. Here King Uspak-Hácon died (from his wound), much regretted by his men; they carried his body to Iona and buried it there. Olaf, who now got the command of the fleet, directed it southwards eager to retake Man, the principal part of his kingdom, but the winter had already set in, and storms, it would seem, forced the fleet to seek shelter for a while under the isle of Copeland on the Irish coast,

[1] Dillon, in his valuable treatise of the battle of Largs, in Archæologia Scot. II. thinks (p. 358, 397) that Bute (Bót) is here named erroneously instead of Cantire, he having not thoroughly understood the words of the Saga, which are clear enough in the best text: „they sailed southwards, past the Mull of Cantire and inn to Bute". He thinks that the Saga gives a southerly direction to the whole course, not being aware of, that the word „southwards" only applies to the Mull, and that the following „inn to Bute" designs a change in the direction. Even our chronicle and that of Lanercost mention Bute.

near Donaghàdec [1]. Yet the same tempest and winter appears also to have driven Earl Alan away, as there is no mention of any danger or hinderance opposed by him, to the further progress of Olaf — if indeed, the story of his great armament was after all true or simply invented to frighten the Norwegians back. When the weather allowed it, Olaf crossed over to Man, where a chieftain, named in the Saga Thorkell Njálson, and afterwards appearing in our Chronicle as *Thorquellus filius Nel* (Torquill Mac Neil) had the command, although it is not said, whether he was left by Alan as his delegate, or whether he had profited by the general disturbances to make himself Lord of the island. Torquil had collected a force, and sought to prevent the Norwegians coming on shore, but when the Manx heard that King Olaf himself was their commander, the declined fighting against him, and dispersed; Torquill was taken prisoner and put in irons. The Manks, however, had no reason to rejoice at their loyalty, being compelled to contribute 3 pence sterl. for every cow on the Island, and moreover to feed the Norwegian forces during the whole winter. Now, it would seem, the division between Olaf and Godred, which is only mentioned in our Chronicle and that of Lanercost, and not in the Saga, was carried into effect. Olaf, it is said, retained Man, and Godred got the „*insulanas partes*", i. e. the other islands, which did not belong to the Somerledian part. That the Somerledian line retained their insular possessions, is expressly stated in the Chronicle of Lanercost, it being said, that Olaf, after the death of Godred, reigned both in Man and the Isles, „*exceptis his quas filii Sumerledi tenuerunt undecim annis*" (i. e. all the eleven years of Olaf's reign). This seems to show, that after the death of Uspak-Hácon the Norwegians gave up for the moment the plan of reducing the Somerledian possessions to obedience, it being much more important to secure this hold upon Man, and perhaps they even made a truce or treaty with the princes, or at least with Duncan, Dugald of whom no further mention is made, had probably been put to death. At all events, however, some hostilities did take place before such a treaty could be concluded. In the spring, namely, the Norwegians again went to Cantire, where they were met by a force of Scots; in the

[1] The island is called the „Kaupmannsey" (merchant's island) in the Saga. It cannot by any other than Copeland Island.

ensuing fight the Scots, it is said, „came and went very loosely"; many were killed on both sides, and while the Norwegians opposed one division of the enemy, another attacked and killed their servants, and took all their kettles, in which they prepared their meals. The Norwegians landed on several parts of Cantire, and ravaged the circumjacent territories, without, however, occupying any place; here, therefore, they must either have concluded the truce with the Somerledians, or resolved to abandon the plan of fighting them, deeming it impracticable. Before leaving Man, two captains of vessels furnished by Earl Sculi set Thorquill Mac Neil free, to the great discontent of the others, but no doubt according to a secret agreement between King Olaf, Paul Bálkason and the Earl's partizans; we learn, at least, from our Chronicle, that Thorquill afterwards appeared as the friend of Olaf's Son Harold. From Cantire the Norwegians went to the Northern Isles, no doubt to help King Godred in securing his power; in Lewis, they had to fight with the above mentioned Dermot, son of Torquill Mac Dermot, who had returned, but was now compelled to flee, leaving his wife and all his possessions as a prey to the enemy. They then repaired to Orkney. But we learn from the Saga, that few days after they left, Paul Bálkason was killed by Godred, and from our Chronicle as well as that of Lanercost, that, about the same time (consequently few days after the death of Paul), Godred was killed in the island of Lewis. This shows, that the withdrawal of the Norwegians must have been the signal of fierce hostilities between the partizans of Olaf and those of Godred, and that the recent treaty did not continue of long duration. In the summer of 1231 the Norwegians returned home, and although it seems to us, that they had not effected very much, King Hácon thanked them heartily for what they had done. So far, however, they had succeeded, that the Supremacy of Norway in the Isles was revived, King Olaf showing himself always as a faithful vassal, although, like his brother, he appeared at the English court, and entered the service of the English king. Here, however, we know exactly the nature of the service, as it is described in a letter from King Henry, still existing; and we learn from this letter, that it contained nothing inconsistent with the duties of Olaf to his liege Lord of Norway, being only the defence of the English and Irish coasts on both sides of the St. George's Channel,

for which service Olaf, like Reginald, was to hold some possessions on the Irish coasts in fief of the English Crown, and to receive certain contributions in corn and wine. This letter is dated July 11th 1235, and the letter of safe conduct accorded by King Henry to King Olaf for coming to his court, and transacting this business, the 13th of April[1]. Yet it appears, that King Hácon did take some umbrage on hearing this, and that he summoned King Olaf to Norway in order to justify himself, as there exists a letter, issued by the English King on May 24th 1236, in which the latter takes the men and possessions etc. of King Olaf under his protection, during the absence of the said Olaf in Norway at the request of the Norwegian King, and another, dated April 8th 1237, where the protection is renewed, and where King Olaf is spoken of as having already begun his journey to Norway[2]. The voyage, however, cannot have been completed, as we learn from our Chronicle, that King Olaf died already on the 21st of May 1237 in Holm Peel, nor is it mentioned in the Saga, that he was ever in Norway after his short visit in 1230. Probably, therefore, he began the journey in crossing over to England, there to look for a passage to Norway, but feeling himself unwell, returned to Man, where shortly afterwards he died. The Saga gives him the express testimonial of having been scrupulously faithful to the Norwegian king. The Norwegians called him „Olaf the swarthy" (Ólafr svarti), no doubt because of his complexion.

P. 20. *Quo mortuo — — usque ad obitum* . . . .] It is noted above, that these words, as well as the preceding ones, from „Manniæ" are written not in the text, but in the lower margin, which shows, that perhaps the whole entry has been inserted subsequently. The lacuna after „*obitum*" might somehow be filled up after the Chronicle of Lanercost, *ad annum* 1230, where it is said; . . . *Post hæc Olavus et Godredus venerunt ad Manniam et diviserunt inter se regnum Manniæ et Insularum; Godredus insulas (insulanas?) partes sortitus est, Olavus Manniam. Occiso autem Godredo Don, Olavus regnavit in Mannia et super omnes Sodorenses insulas exceptis quas filii Sumerledi tenuerunt undecim annis.*" It is evident, that this entry has sprung from the same source as that of our Chronicle, only the words being a little different; the wanting part,

[1] Extracted by Rymer Foedera I. 1. p. 212, also in Langebek Scriptt. Rer. Dan. III. p. 230. [2] Extracted by Rymer l. c. p. 231. Script. R. D. III. p. 231.

therefore, seems to have contained something to the same purpose as what is said of Olaf having reigned over all the Sudreys with exception of those held by the Somerled branch.

P. 21. *In ipsa igitur æstate etc.*] Of all the events, told in this narrative as well as in the entries for the years 1238, 1239, 1240, 1242, 1243, not a word is spoken in the Saga, not even of King Harold's long stay from 1239—1242 at the court of King Hácon. Indeed, it would rather seem, that the latter, distrusting Harold as the the secret partizan of his father-in-law, Duke Skúli, who coveted the crown, and had at last begun hostilities, summoned him to Norway in order to keep him in strict surveillance, perhaps even in prison, and that he did not release him or confer on him his favour till after the Duke's fall in 1240. The return of Harold in 1242 is also mentioned in the Chron. of Lanercost, but „Godredus" is wrongly written instead of „Haraldus" [1].

P. 22. *Gillescrist* (i. e. Gillechrist) *filius Murkertach*]. This is no doubt the same Gilchrist spoken of in the Saga of King Hácon, (Ch. 102), in 1224, as having then arrived at Bergen from the Isles, accompanied by Ottar Snækollsson and many other Islanders, bringing many letters about the affairs of their land.

Anno m°cc°xxx°vij°, xij°. kal. Jun. obiit Olavus Godredi filius]. An entry about the death of King Olaf on the 21 of May 1237 exists in the Chronicle of Lanercost, the name of Olaf, however, is corrupted into „Alan", no doubt by a blunder of the scriptor, who read „Olauus" as „Olanus" or „Alanus". He was succeeded, it is added, by his son Harold 14 years of age, who reigned 12 years.

P. 23. *Haraldus miles factus etc.*] This did not happen, as our Chronicle says, in 1247, but in 1246, see Matth. Paris. (p. 474), who records this even at Easter 1246, as well as the letter of safe conduct, dated Jan. 9 1246, accorded by King Henry to Harold for coming to and returning from England, during the time till Whitsunday [2]. The year 1247, however, is rightly said to be that, in which King Hácon of Norway summoned Harold to his court. The Chronicle of Lanercost,

[1] „Eodem anno Godredus venit cum magna classe navium ad Manniam, coepitque disponere de regno suo prout voluit."

[2] Extracted by Rymer, l. c. p. 264.

which has the same entry almost verbally agreeing with our Chronicle, adds that Harold was summoned in order to be present at the King's coronation [1]. This, however, cannot be the case, if the summons were not addressed to Harold till immediately („*statim*") before his depart, which, as is expressly stated in both Chronicles, happened in the autumn, while the coronation already took place on the day of St. Olaf (July 29), the summons to be present at which ought to have been issued in the spring or early in the summer. Likewise the accurate Saga of King Hácon says, that Harold did not arrive in Bergen till after the depart of King Hácon to Oslo, which happened in September or October, and that he joined him at Oslo, where he passed the winter at his court [2]. If then, the summons were not issued to Harold in the spring, which, very likely was the case, the reason cannot have been that the king wished him to be present at the coronation, but it is rather to be supposed, that he had taken some umbrage from the visit of Harold at the English court, and that he requested Harold to personally afford the due explanation and justification. We have seen, that likewise Olaf, the father of Harold, was summoned to Norway immediately after a visit of this kind to the English court, and no doubt for the same reasons. Very likely, however, the presence at the coronation was given as a kind of pretext. At all events the suspicion, if there was any, cannot have lasted long, and the explanations given by Harold must have been found sufficient, as we see, that he soon came into the greatest favour with the king, and obtained his daughter in marriage. This daughter was Cecilia, born about 1220 before his marriage, and widow of the most noble Sir Gregory Andresson of Stovreim († 1246) nephew of King Philip. The betrothal took place at Oslo during the winter, and the wedding was celebrated in the following summer with great splendour in the royal palace at Bergen, few days after the terrible fire, which (on the 4th of July, 1248) devastated the greater part of the city, and no doubt spread a gloom which splendour of the bridal rejoicings, could scarcely disperse, and which most likely gave occasion

[1] Eodem [anno] misit Haco rex Nortweyæ propter Haraldum regem Manniæ ut interesset coronationi suæ, qui statim iter arripuit per Angliam autumnali tempore etc.

[2] Hák. Hák. S. Ch. 260.

to serious apprehensions for the future fate of the young couple [1].

Eodem anno obiit b. m. Symon]. For the whole of this entry, concerning the election of a new bishop of Man after the demise of Simon, we refer to the part of our Chronicle which treats of the bishops especially.

Anno m^0cc^0xl^0ix^0. Haraldus Olavi filius etc.] The year is wrong, as the departure of Harold and his Queen from Norway happened in 1248, two months after their marriage, and their death consequently in the following month of October or November. The Saga of King Hácon mentions expressly the departure and death of the young couple, together with the events connected therewith, in 1248 [2], likewise the Icelandic annals, and even our Chronicle, in stating afterwards, that Reginald, the successor of Harold, began his reign on the 6th of May 1249, makes it impossible that Harold could have departed „*circum festum Sancti Michaelis*" in the same year; this departure must be assigned to the preceding year. However, the Chronicle of Lanercost, which has the same entry with some small variations [3], names likewise the year 1249, and therefore we might perhaps infer, that the news of Harold's death did not reach Man till after the commencement of 1249, which surmise gains probability by the circumstance, that Reginald did not begin his reign earlier than in the month of May, 1249. To Norway the melancholy news arrived in the beginning of the winter, as it is expressly said in the Saga, that it reached King Hácon in the city of Tunsberg, immediately before he repaired to Oslo, there to spend the main part of the winter season. The circumstances of the tragical event are thus mentioned in the Saga: „the vessel, which carried the royal couple with their suite, was never heard of nor seen, except that some pieces

[1] The fire has been described as well in the Saga Ch. 260, as by Matthew of Paris who was an eyewitness (p. 504).

[2] Hák. Hák. S. Ch. 260.

[3] Eodem anno (1249) Haraldus rex Manniæ et Insularum cum uxore sua, filia regis Nortwegiæ, et cum multis aliis clericis et laicis venit de Nortwegia redire volens ad propria. Cumque venisset prope fines Yselandiæ exorta tempestate valida, naufragium pertulit, et cum omni comitatu suo demersus est. Regnavit, ut diximus, 12 annis.

[4] Rymer, l. c. p. 338.

of wreck were thrown on shore by the seas at the southernmost point of Shetland, from which it was inferred that it had perished in *Dynröst* (Sumburgh Roost between Shetland and Fair Isle, Dynröst still surviving in the name Dunrossnes, i. e. *Dynrastarnes*, the promontory of Dynröst). It is, therefore, obvious, that by „Jadlandia" in our Chronicle, Shetland (properly *Hjaltland*, very often *Hjatland*) is meant. In the Chron. of Lanercost the name is corrupted into „Yselandia".

During the time of Harold's departure from Norway and subsequent death there were also two other Sudreyan princes at the court of King Hácon, of whom, however, our Chronicle makes no mention. These were *Eugenius* or *Eogan* of Argyll, whom the Saga calls *Jon*, our Chronicle (p. 25) *Johannes*, and Matthew of Paris *Oenus* or *Genus*[1], son of the above mentioned Duncan, grandson of Somerled by Dugald, and *Dugald*, son of Rory of Cantire, grandson of Somerled by Reginald. They went to the court, it is said, asking for the title of Kings in the northern (or rather eastern) part of the Isles. This shows, that their fathers Duncan and Rory must have died shortly before. Eogan, the Saga says, was a righteous and trustworthy man, which also appears from what is told of his honorable behaviour towards his two suzerains, the Norwegian and the Scottish King, when it was impossible to remain the vassal of the one without being the enemy of the other. When Eogan and Dugald appeared at the court, King Hácon prepared an expedition to the frontier of Sweden, there to meet and treat with the Swedish king about some differences, which had existed for a long time between both kingdoms, and being eager to appear with some splendour, in order to give more weight to his reclamations, he ordered even Eogan and Dugald to follow him in the fleet. Already, however, when anchoring at *Eldeyjarsund* not far from Bergen, he gave Eogan the royal title investing him, it appears, with the Isle of Mull[2], and permitted

[1] In Latin documents, Eogan is called *Eugenius* (see Archæol Scot. II. p. 399), and so even by Fordun, X. 24. In the French edition of Matth. Paris. (p. 516) he is called *Oenus*, in the London one (from which the passage concerning him is reproduced in the Archæol. Scot. l. c.) *Genus*.

[2] It is said, namely, by Matthew of Paris (p. 516) that Eogan held „an island between the Orkneys and Scotland" - i. e. on the way from the western coast of Scotland to Orkney; the Saga says, that he held from

him to go back to Bergen, while Dugald must remained with the king. The Saga does not mention, whether Dugald got the title on the same occasion; yet it is very likely that he did get it, at least during the expedition, because henceforth he is styled „King Dugald". The meeting, however, did not take place, and Dugald returned to Bergen, it being the plan, that he and Eogan should accompany King Harold on his return to the Isles. Luckily for them that was not done; they remained at Bergen, the Saga does not say why; probably the king, on second thoughts, had deemed it more advisable to retain them for a while. Dugald went back to the king at Tunsberg, to pass the winter with him, Eogan intended to stay at Bergen. But when the news of Harold's decease reached the king, Hácon not wishing that the Isles should be left without any rulers, sent message to Eogan, that he should return immediately to the Sudreys and take charge of the kingdom until the king had time to take proper measures [1]. Eogan, it appears, went away immediately, or at least in the spring of 1249, as it is certain as well from the Saga as Matthew of Paris, that he had returned some time before the death of King Alexander II., which happened in the month of July 1249 [2]. Dugald, it is certain, had not yet left Norway in 1253, because it is expressly told, that he took part of the great expedition to the frontier in that year, where also King Magnus of Man was present, as will be seen hereafter; since 1253, he is not mentioned till 1263, when he is spoken of as one of the princes in the Isles, who had remained faithful to King Hácon; in the meantime, therefore, he must have returned to his possessions.

Coepit Reginaldus Olavi filius regnare]. This is also told in the Chronicle of Lanercost, with the slight alteration, that Reginald's assassination is assigned to the 1st of July, and his reign consequently said to have lasted for 27 days. Instead of „*ab Yuaro milite et a suis*" the Lanercost Chronicle has „ab hominibus Yvari militis". There seems to have been a conspiration between Harold the son of Godred and

the Norwegian King the castle of Cairnburgh and three other castles, no doubt the three other situated in Mull, viz. Duart, Aros and Moy.

[1] Hácon H. Saga Ch. 260—264.

[2] We shall, namely, presently see, that there were some serious *démêlés* between him and King Alexander.

Sir Ivar, because in a letter issued by King Henry of England on the 21st of April 1256, an order is given to all authorities, not to receive Harold or Ivar, who had shamefully murdered King Reginald, nor their accomplices [1]. Of this Sir Ivar, however, nothing more is known, maybe he belonged to the royal family of the Isles.

P. 24. *Eodem tempore Alexander rex Scotiæ etc.*] We have already mentioned the eagerness of King Alexander to get hold of Man and the Isles. In 1244, we learn from the Saga, he made the first open *démarche* towards this aim, in sending two bishops (it is not mentioned who they were) to King Hácon, firstly to ascertain, whether he might be inclined to yield up willingly that kingdom in the Isles, which his ancestor King Magnus Barefoot had „unjustly“ taken from King Edgar (Malcolm, as the Saga has, i. e. Edgar Mac Malcolm, see p. 66), and if this demand was refused, to ask him, if he would sell them for a sum of money. Hácon replied, that when King Magnus established his authority in the Sudreys, they were governed by King Godred, but that Magnus regarded them as his hereditary possessions; at all events the King of Scotland had no right thereto, and afterwards it having been agreed on by a formal treaty between Magnus and Edgar, what Norway should have, there could be consequently no right to them on the part of the Scottish king. As to selling them, he was not in so great want of silver, that he felt obliged to sell his hereditary possessions. This answer the bishops brought back, and now, it appears, new embassies were sent every year to the same purpose, but in vain, wherefore, says the Saga, he determined very unkingly to prepare an armaments, while the negociations were still pending, that he might take the coveted islands by main force, at the same time secretly tampering with the chieftains. He declared in his rage, that he would not rest till he had planted his banner east of Thursasker [2] and conquered all the lands which the Norwegians possessed west of the North Sea, consequently even Orkney and Shetland. The first to feel his resentment was Eogan, who had just returned from Norway, and with whom he was very angry because he had sworn allegiance to the Norwegian

[1] Rymer, l. c. p. 338.

[2] This must have been a rock or skerry eastward either of Orkney or Shetland, the place of which we have not been able to find.

king, although being a Scotch subject. He had him summoned to his court, and Eogan obeyed [1], yet not before he had got a safe conduct guaranteed by four Scotch earls. Alexander now upbraided Eogan with treachery; Eogan replying that he might very well fulfil his duties to both kings. Alexander, however, answered with the words of the gospel, that it was impossible to serve two masters at once; Eogan maintaining, that this could very well be done, when the two masters were not at war with each other. Now, however, when Alexander was on the eve of beginning war with Hácon, it was necessary that Eogan declared himself for one of the two parties; and Alexander even went so far as to demand, that he should yield up to him the whole fief, which he had received from King Hácon (this was, as we have seen, the Isle of Mull), promising him in compensation lands of double the same extent in Scotland, and his friendship to boot. The friends and relatives of Eogan bade him most eagerly to consent; the brave Eogan, however, feeling that, although he might have the right to declare himself for the Scotch king, he could not honourably do so without previously and formally renouncing his allegiance to King Hácon, and that it would be an act of felony to yield up to his enemy the fiefs which he held from his hand; and thinking himself perhaps now doubly bound to King Hacon as he had been entrusted by him with a kind of vicegerency, declined to comply with the request, and left the court, repairing for safety to the remote island of Lewis. Alexander prepared to follow him with an armed force, and Eogan, now seriously alarmed, declared himself ready to take his part, if he would only allow him a term for renouncing his services to King Hácon and restoring to him his fief. Of this, however, Alexander would hear nothing, and sailed, but when lying at anchor in Kerrera Sound, died from a sudden fever on the 8th of July, 1249. The Saga tells, that St. Olaf, St. Magnus and St. Columba appeared to him in a dream the night before his death menacing him with evils, if he persisted in his design. Also Matthew of Paris, the friend of King Hácon, represents the proceedings of Alexander as unfair, saying that in the last days of his life he diverged from the path of righteousness, while Fordun, the zealous patriot, in

[1] Matthew of Paris does not expressly say, that Eogan went personally to Alexander, the Saga, however, puts it beyond doubt.

mentioning his enmity with the Lord of Argyll, praises him, and calls him a hater of iniquity [2]. The death of Alexander saved Eogan from this imminent peril, as the son and successor of Alexander, Alexander III, was a mere boy of seven years. Eogan, it appears, remained yet for a couple of years in his allegiance to the Norwegian crown, and from our Chronicle we learn, that in 1250, when Harold was summoned to Norway, he acted still in the capacity of trustee or vicegerent, with which he had been invested by King Hácon, in bringing the third son of King Olaf to Man, supported by a Norwegian force. He wounded, however, the sensibility of the Manks in making use of his royal title, and the Chronicle relates, how the enterprize failed. Since that time, it seems that Eogan resigned the title as well as his allegiance to Norway, because in a letter still preserved, issued by him in the year 1251, he styles himself only „Eogan, knight, son of Duncan of Argyll“ [1]; and in 1263, he appears as the subject and decided partizan of Alexander III. We learn, however, from the Saga, that not till then he resigned his fiefs.

P. 25. *Haraldus filius Godredi Don vocatus etc.*] Of this no mention at all is made in our Saga, neither of the other events commemorated in this and the following year. When Harold was summoned to Norway, he had even opened negotiations with the English king, as appears from a letter of safe conduct issued by king Henry Decbr. 28 1250, „for our beloved and faithful Haraldus King of Man“ to repair to England there to consult with the King [2].

P. 25. *Johannes filius Dugaldi*]. The reason why Eogan of Argyll interested himself for Magnus, was perhaps, that the latter had then already married his daughter; for we learn from Fordun, where the death of Magnus is related, that he had been married to „filia Eugenii de Ergadia“, who after his death married Malise earl of Stratherne. This may also prove the identity of Eugenius or Eogan of Argyll and

[2] Hák. Hák. S. Ch. 265. Matth. Paris. p. 516. Fordun IX. 63. Chron. de Mailros. Kerrera (in our text Kerwaray) is called in the Saga *Kjarbarey* (Cairbar-island); in the Chr. de Mailros *Geruerei* (perhaps misread for *Ceruerei)* in the edit. of Fordun it is misprinted *Kerneray* for *Kerueray*.

[1] Archæol. Scot. II. 399.

[2] Rymer, I. p. 272.

the here so-called Johannes fil. Dugaldi, more properly Duncani or Dungadi.

P. 26. *Juvenis qui Yuarum militem comitabatur*] this shows, that it was the partizans of Harold, who fought against Magnus and Eogan.

P. 26. *Magnus Olavi filius profectus est ad curiam etc.*] The journey of Magnus to Norway must have taken place in May 1253, as there is a letter of safe conduct for him and his followers, issued by King Henry on Apr. 30, 1253, to go unmolested through England to Norway and likewise back again. The presence of Magnus in Norway is also somehow mentioned in the Saga, Ch. 271; that is to say, by a mistake or forgetfulness of names, John (Eogan) king of the Sudreys is named instead of Magnus. It is said that when Hácon in the month of June went from Bergen with a large fleet, to meet the Swedish Earl and Regent Byrgir at Gullbergseið (near the present site of Gothenburg), there to concert measures about a war with Denmark, he had three kings among his followers; the one was his son Hácon, already designed as his successor, the other „John King of the Sudreys", the third King Dugald. As for John or Eogan, however, we have seen, that he had already resigned his title of King, and consequently his allegiance to Norway, in 1251, it is therefore impossible that he could have been in Norway, and in the suite of Hácon, in 1253; moreover, when Magnus came to King Hacon in the end of May or beginning of June 1253, it is next to impossible, that he should not follow the king on the expedition, and in this case there had been four kings, if John or Eogan likewise was in the fleet. There can be no objection taken from what our Chronicle relates, that Magnus was not formally confirmed by Hácon in the kingdom till his return in 1254, for he used certainly the title of King, to which he had hereditary right from his being received as King by the Manks in 1252. Of that formal investment in 1254, however, which no doubt took place at Christmas time, as was usual with such solemnities, no mention is made in the Saga.

P. 26. *Magnus . . . curiam domini Regis Angliæ*]. This visit took place at easter time (about Apr. 16), as we learn from Matthew of Paris (p. 521) and the above mentioned letter of King Henry dated on the 21st of April, in which he orders his men not to receive Harold the son of Godred or Sir Ivar. From this letter, however, it would appear, that Harold then was supposed not to be any more in custody

in Norway. We see, likewise, that Magnus felt it his duty to revenge as far as possible his brother's death.

P. 27. *Venit Haco etc.*] The special motives of King Hácon's expedition are not mentioned in our Chronicle, and Fordun's narrative of this event being very deficient, we shall give shortly the whole account chiefly from the excellent Saga of King Hácon, especially as very wrong ideas of these affairs appear to be prevailing among the Scotch public, although Dillon, in his valuable treatise of the battle of Largs (in the Archæol. Scot. Vol. II.) has done very much to correct many errors. We might, indeed, acquiesce in what Dillon has done, if it were not that he too had been mistaken in some points. About the events in the Islands between 1249 and 1261 the Saga is utterly silent, nor do we learn much from our Chronicle and the Scotch historians. Where the Saga resumes the narrative of the events in the Isles, the above mentioned Dugald (Dugald Mac Rory) is now generally spoken of as the sole King in his part of the Isles. He is characterized as being firm and unshaken in his fidelity to king Hácon, we find moreover, that one of his sons, named Eric, remained at King Hácon's court, no doubt as a kind of hostage, and this Eric continued to reside in Norway, even after the cession of the Isles to Scotland, as one of the principal barons of Norway. Eogan, although the connexion between him and Norway does not seem to have been formally severed, or at least the hope of King Hácon not quite given up, that he might still be brought back to his allegiance, is nevertheless mentioned as a secondary person. We have seen, that he had dropped the title of King in 1251, perhaps he had sworn allegiance already then to the young King Alexander, although he did not resign his Norwegian fiefs till the arrival of King Hácon himself in 1263. When King Alexander became of age (1262) and even a short time before, he resumed the plan, cherished by his father, of reuniting the Sudreys to the Scottish crown, and sent two envoys to Norway in 1261; an Archdeacon, and a Knight, named Missell, no doubt to negotiate for the cession of the Isles. The King, however, it is said, got to know, that they used only fair words, without sincerity; being, perhaps, aware of his displeasure, they tried to steal secretly away, without asking for passport, contrary to all customs; but they were stopped by express order of the king, who told

them, that as a punishment they should stay in Norway the whole winter. King Alexander, on receiving news of this, was much exasperated; he complained to his father-in-law, King Henry of England, who wrote to King Hácon on the 23d of March 1262 [1], about the release of the envoys and other matters; it is even hinted, that the envoys were not treated decently, which, however, appears not to be true, as we find, that Sir Missell f. inst. was present at the coronation of king Magnus on the 14th of September 1261, and, seemingly, in one of the best places in the church [2]. The accusation was also formally denied in a letter from Hácon, in which he bade king Henry to understand, that now he had permitted the envoys to return without any hinderance, solemnly protesting that it had not been his intention to begin war with the king of Scots: the receipt of which letter king Henry acknowledged in another, dated Nov. 15. 1262, expressing his gratitude for the kindness shown by Hácon to the envoys, offering his mediation, and promising to exert his influence with the king of Scots, in order to induce the latter to repair the damages which king Hácon or his subjects had suffered from himself or his men [3]. Meanwhile, however, matters had changed; in the summer of 1262 there came a letter from king Dugald announcing, that earl William of Ross with other Scotch chieftains had made an attack upon the Isle of Skye, and committed the most barbarous cruelties, burning churches and houses, killing men and women, and staking small children upon spears; it was added, that king Alexander meant to conquer all the Isles. It is, therefore, evident, that the attack was made by his order; we find, moreover, that hostages were taken from Skye, and kept in custody at the cost of the Crown [4]. Hácon being now greatly alarmed, determined, after duly deliberating with his council, to go to war with Scotland, which indeed was unavoidable, the Scotch having already commenced hostilities. This we expressly beg to remark, as Scotch historians, not aware of the real state of things, have taxed Hácon with duplicity for using so fair words, when really

[1] Rymer. I. p. 389.

[2] Hák. H. S. Ch. 309.

[3] Rymer. I. p. 422. V. Appendix.

[4] Fragm. of Chamberlains Rolls, in Archæol. Scot. II. 363.

making preparations for war [1]. Fordun (X. Ch. 16, 17) speaks with some uncertainty about a rumour, that some of the Scotch Magnates had written secretly to Hácon, promising to aid him against their king, if he came to Scotland; how far this be true, must remain in doubt, because we want more accurate accounts thereof; yet the party-spirit in Scotland in those times is so well known, that there would be no wonder if letters of the above description were really written. In the beginning of 1263 king Hácon issued orders for collecting the forces, which were to assemble at Bergen towards the commencement of the summer. Here the king, who had passed the winter at Throndheim, arrived on the 3d of May, and was shortly afterwards joined by his son, king Magnus. The king, it is said, dispatched two men, both, as it appears, natives of Scotland or the western countries, John (probably grandson, by a daughter, to Earl Harold in Orkney), and Henry Scott, to the Sudreys for the purpose of collecting good pilots for the fleet on its sailing through the intricate sounds and lochs of western Scotland; perhaps they also had to summon earl Magnus of Orkney to Norway, as we learn from the Saga, that he indeed was present there during the summer, and sailed from Bergen with the fleet. Maybe king Hácon thought it rather unsafe to trust him in his double capacity of vassal to the crown of Norway as well as to that of Scotland without exacting from him some extraordinary oaths and securities, especially as we find that king Alexander had forced the men of Caithness to give hostages, as he had those of Skye [2]. Or perhaps Alexander had invested Magnus with war, and that Magnus fled to Hácon for protection. The two above mentioned messengers repaired to king Dugald and told him, that the fleet would arrive. The Scotch, it is said, meant to attack the Isles even this summer, but Dugald now gave out the rumour, that a Norwegian fleet of 40 sail might be expected; this news made the Scotch hesitate in beginning the attack.

When the forces were collected, the king summoned them to a

[1] Lord Hailes, Annals, I. 212. Even if Hácon had acted with duplicity, which was not the case, he might justify himself sufficiently with the fact, that king Alexander had begun hostilities and tampered with the king's vassals while still negociating.

[2] Fragm. of Chamberl. Rolls, l. c.

meeting, at which he narrated the outrages committed by the Scotch, and declared his intention to take revenge. The government at home he committed to his son Magnus, with two prudent and expert Barons as councillors. Before leaving Bergen himself, he sent some barons with 8 ships, as it appears, to the assistance of king Magnus of Man; they were, however, detained by contrary winds, so that in reality they did not leave the coasts of Norway till after the main fleet, yet they made it up by sailing so much faster, and some of them did not see land till passing Souliskerry; thence they made for Diurnes, where they landed, destroying a castle and burning twenty farms; at last they joined king Magnus of Man. The king, meanwhile, had moved from Bergen to the neighbouring port of Eidsvaag, and from thence to the out-port of Herdluver, whence he sailed directly for Shetland, on the 15th of July. Among the great men who followed him in the fleet, was Earl Magnus of Orkney, as aforesaid, whom he presented with a good ship of war, a sign of the excellent understanding now existing between them, the two bishops, Thorgils of Stavanger and Gilbert of Hamar formerly archdeacon of Shetland, the abbot of Holm, etc. The number of ships forming the fleet is not precisely given in the Saga, which says only that, when complete, it exceeded 120 sail; Fordun states the number of ships with which king Hácon appeared off Ayr, to have been about 160, with a force of 20000 men, and this seems to be, on the whole, not far from the truth. That the reports of the armament, preceding the king's arrival in the western Seas, caused no little alarm in Scotland and even in England, as appears from a letter, written by R. de Neville, to the royal chancellor of England, in order to get the sufficient money for guarding the lands and castles assigned to his care north of Trent, especially Bamborough, as it was said, and believed to be true, that not only the Norwegian but also the Danish king had arrived at the Isles with a large fleet, it not being ascertained, whither they meant to repair [1]. Of the preparations made by the king of Scots, the fragments of „Chamberlains Rolls", quoted by Dillon (Archæologia Scot. II. 389 — 391) give ample evidences; we see, that the fortifications of Inverness, Ayr, Wigtoun, Stirling, and perhaps other castles, were repaired and the garrisons increased, vessels built etc.

[1] Rymer. I. p. 429. V. Appendix.

Especially the castle of Ayr, where the chief attack must have been expected, appears to have been the centre of the movements. Two chieftains, no doubt of the Somerled branch, Angus Mac'Donald of Isla and Murchard, were compelled to yield their sons as hostages [1]. In two days, the greater part of the fleet reached Shetland, where the king remained in Bressa sound for about a fortnight, probable waiting for those vessels which during the passage had been separated from the main fleet. About the 20th of July, the king sailed to the Orkneys, and anchored in Elwick harbour at Shapensey, opposite Kirkwall. Here he held a council of war, declaring his plan of dividing the fleet in two parts, of which the smaller, chiefly consisting of yeomen or the militia troops, was directed to run into Moray firth and ravage the east coast of Scotland, while with the greater, under his own command, he intended to go at once to the Sudreys. This resolution, however, being announced to the men, the yeomen declared that they would go nowhere except under the immediate command of the king, whose authority was not so great, but that he felt obliged to yield. No division, therefore, took place. Immediately after St. Olaf's day (July 29), which was celebrated with great solemnity, the king moved from Elwick to Ronaldsvoe, where again he lay for about eleven days, dispatching men to Caithness, there to exact a contribution from the inhabitants, threatening them with immediate attack and ravages, if they did not comply. They obeyed, although, as we have seen, having beforehand given hostage to king Alexander in pledge of their fidelity. During the king's stay at Ronaldsvoe, the Saga relates that, an eclipse of the Sun happened, only a small ring around the Sun being bright. This is a strong proof of the accuracy and trustworthiness of the Saga, as it may be seen from the eclipse tables, that an eclipse really happened on the 5th of August, and, according to special calculation, this eclipse appeared annular precisely at Ronaldsvoe [2]. On St. Lawrence day (Aug. 10) the king sailed from Ronaldsvoe, having ascertained, that some ships not yet ready when he left Bergen, had arrived at the Sudreys. The Orkneyans, who where also to furnish ships and troops, had not yet completed their armament, but the Earl was ordered to follow, as soon as he had got ready.

[1] Fragm. of Chamberl. Rolls, l. c.

[2] See Archæol. Scot. II. p. 363, 364.

However on the same day, the king doubled Cape Wrath, the next he went to Lewis, thence eastward of Skye, to Rona and Raasay, and into the Sound of Skye, where he anchored near a little island, called Kerlingarsteinn or Cailleach-stone [1]. Here he was joined by the king of Man and the barons, who had been sent away beforehand. He then proceeded to the Sound of Mull, falling in with king Dugald, who came in a light craft now acting as a pilotboat, and requested the king to follow as fast as possible. In this manner the fleet was conducted to Kerrera, where the forces gathered in the Isles were already assembled, and joining the main fleet, brought the total number of ships to the amount already mentioned.

From Kerrera, king Hácon sent 50 ships under the command of king Dugald, king Magnus and some Norwegian barons to the isthmus of Kentire, and 15 ships to Bute, where the castle of Rothsay was held by a Scotch garrison, while he went himself with the rest of the fleet round Kentire to Gigha. His object was evidently first of all to intimidate the above mentioned chieftains, Angus of Isla and Murchard, and this aim seems to have been easily effected. They offered their submission through the medium of king Dugald; and nothwithstanding their having previously given hostages to king Alexander sought audience of king Hácon, throwing themselves upon his mercy, swearing allegiance, and pledging their faith by giving hostages; in return king Hácon promised to have them included in the treaty of peace, if such should be effected. Their possessions in Kentire were taxed to a contribution of 1200 neats. Meanwhile, the frequently mentioned Eogan, who, it seems, although declaring for Alexander, had not yet formally resigned his Norwegian fiefs, appeared, perhaps summoned to do so, in the king's presence. He went on board the ship of bishop Thorgils, no doubt

[1] *Kerlingr*, in Lowlands *Carline* (vetula) is the same as *Cailleach* in Gaelic, so the place has not changed its name. It seems to be a common belief in the west of Scotland that Kyle Haken between Skye and Lochalsh has got its name from king Hácon having anchored there. Nothing can be more absurd. This name, as no doubt most of the other local names, was certainly many centuries older than king Hácon. It is, moreover, very probable, that the greater part of the rude inhabitans did not even know his name.

to claim his protection, and bade the king release him from his allegiance, as well as to receive back the above mentioned fiefs, because he had now sworn oaths of fidelity to king Alexander. The king at first desired him to consider the matter, and retained him in the fleet for a while without, however, shaking his purpose [1]. The abbot of Sandal [2] applied personally to the king for a safe conduct to his monastery, which was immediately granted. Shortly afterwards, when the dominican friar, brother Simon, who had been employed by the king in several diplomatic missions, and had now even followed him on this expedition, happened to die while the fleet lay off Gigha, his body was interred in the church of Sandal, and the monks there believed him to be a Saint. The Scotch knight, who had the command of Donaverty castle [3] in Kentire, no doubt terrified at the progress of the king, and at the hostilities already commenced in his neighbourhood, capitulated; the king thereon appointed a Norwegian, Guthorm Bakkakolf, commander of the castle. Kentire being thus reduced, the king sent some light vessels to hasten the reduction of Rothsay castle, but that was now superfluous, the castle having already capitulated on the condition that the garrison should depart unmolested. This condition, however, was violated by one Rory, of whom our Saga relates, that he had been outlawed by king Alexander because asserting the Island of Bute to be his patrimony, and failing to get this claim acknowledged by the Scotch king, had committed many hostilities in Scotland; but that when king Hácon appeared in these parts, he had come to him with his two brothers for protection and sworn him allegiance; at the siege of Rothsay he had commanded a ship, and now, the garrison having departed according to the capitulation, he overtook it and killed nine men, alledging that he personally had not promised them anything [4]. There

[1] Hák. Hák. Saga Ch. 320.

[2] Ibid. The Saga does not mention the name of the monastery, but speaks only of an „abbot of a greymonk's cloister"; thus, however, the Cistercian were styled, and the monastery of Sandal in Kentire is the only Cistercian monastery of which there could be question.

[3] Even this castle is not expressly named, but only styled „a castle in the south of Kentire."

[4] H. H. S. Ch. 321.

can hardly be any doubt, that this Rory, whose father and ancestors are not mentioned in the Saga, was a descendant of Somerled. From Bute, the Norwegians and Rory of their own accord made inroads upon the mainland of Scotland, committing many ravages. The mouth of the Clyde now lay open to the Norwegian fleet. The wind, that for a time had prevented the king from leaving Gigha, now became favourable; he sailed with the whole fleet round the Moul of Kentire to Arran, and anchored in Lamlash harbour, on the east side of Arran, opposite the main coast of Scotland [1]. He passed, consequently, the town of Ayr, situated on this coast, where, it appears, as we have seen, the main attack had already been expected by the Scottish king [2]. To this sailing past, or no doubt quite close to, Ayr, Fordun alludes narrating that „*Rex Aco Norvegiæ venit apud Novum Castrum de Are cum piraticis navibus octies viginti, habentibus intra se viginti millia hominum belligerorum*" [3]. Fordun, we remark, does not say that he *landed*, only that he *arrived* off Ayr; yet his words have been misinterpreted by Buchanan, who says expressly that Hácon landed at Ayr with 20,000 men. It is, however, an error, when Fordun gives the 1st of August (*Petri ad vincula*, Lammass) as the date of this arrival, which rather must have occurred a month later, as the king had not yet left the Orkneys on the day of the eclipse, which happened on the 5th of August.

When king Hácon appeared off Ayr, and anchored at Arran, king Alexander, who appears to have been present himself at Ayr or in the neighbourhood of the town with the greater part of his forces, now opened negotiations, sending several messages by Franciscan or Dominican friars, for the purpose of treating for peace. Nor did king Hácon show himself unwilling to negotiate, and proved this sufficiently by permitting Eogan of Argyll to depart in peace, loading him moreover with presents, on the condition that he should do his best to

[1] Lamlash is called Melasey in the Saga, Molassa by Buchanan; it has got its name from the hermit St. Macliosa (Servant of Jesus) or Malise, otherwise Molios, to whose cave pilgrimages were made and votive gifts offered.

[2] We learn even, that king Alexander had taken quarters in Ayr, when negotiations were opened, shortly after the arrival of king Hácon to Arran.

[3] Fordun, II. 15.

bring about a reconciliation; Eogan pledging himself, if he did not succeed, to return to king Hácon. Perhaps it was due to the exertions of Eogan, that a truce was concluded, in order to commence negotiations in a more formal manner. King Hácon now dispatched an embassy, consisting of the two bishops, Gilbert of Hamar and Henry of Orkney, with three barons, to Alexander, whom they found at Ayr [1]; they were well received, but could not get any definite answer, Alexander alleging that before proposing the conditions he must consult with his councillors; this done, he should not fail to let king Hácon know the result. The Norwegian messengers therefore returned to their king, who meanwhile had removed to Bute [2]; the next day, however, messengers arrived from king Alexander, bringing a list of those Isles which he would not resign, viz. Arran, Bute and the Cumreys (that is, generally speaking, the Isles inside Kentire), which implies, that he now offered to renounce his claim to all the others. It is certainly not to be wondered at that he did not like to see those Isles, which commanded the entrance to the Clyde, in the hands of another power. King Hácon, however, had prepared another list containing the names of all those Isles which he claimed for the crown of Norway; and although the exact contents are not known, there can be no doubt that at least Arran and Bute were among the number. The Saga says, that on the whole there was after all no great difference, but that nevertheless no final reconciliation could be obtained, the Scotchmen trying only to protract the nogotiations because the summer was past, and the bad weather had begun. The Scotch messengers at last returned, and king

[1] In the Saga, which only records these facts, the town where the messengers found king Alexander, is called *Noar*, which evidently is a corruption of *New Ayr* (Newton of Ayr).

[2] There can be no doubt, that during the stay in Lamlash harbour, either this time or when the fleet returned thither in October, many devout Norwegians made visits to to St. Maclios Cave, and it is very likely, that it is one of these visitors who has left a short runic inscription, still to be seen, and first discovered and published by Dr. Wilson in his Archæology of Scotland; viz.: Nikulos a Hæne ræist, i. e. Nicholas on Hæn engraved (scil. the runes); Hæn seems to be the Norwegian estate of this name in the Raumsdal, and the runes have exactly the character peculiar to those used in Norway in the 13th century.

Hácon removed with the fleet to the Cumreys near Largs in the district of Cuningham, no doubt with a view of being either nearer at hand, if the negotiations failed, and a landing was to be effected, or only of intimidating his opponents, and hastening the conclusion of the peace as the roadstead in itself seems to have been far less safe than that of Lamlash or Bute. King Alexander sent indeed several messages, and it was agreed to hold a new congress a little farther up in the country, which shows that king Alexander now had removed from Ayr to a spot nearer Largs, perhaps to Camphill (on the road from Largs to Kilbirnie), where a local tradition states the king encamped [1]. The Norwegian messengers were as before some bishops and barons; the Scotch commissaries were some knights and monks; the deliberations were long, but still without any result; at last, when the day was declining, a crowd of Scotchmen began to gather, and as it continued to increase the Norwegians not thinking themselves safe, returned without having obtained anything. The Norwegian warriors now demanded earnestly, that the truce should be renounced, because their provisions had begun to be scarce, and they wanted to plunder. King Hácon accordingly sent one of his esquires named Kolbein to king Alexander with the letter, issued by this monarch ordering him to claim back that given by himself and thus declare the truce to be ended, previously, however, proposing that both kings should meet at the head of their respective armies, and try a personal conference before coming to extremities; only if that failed, they might go to battle as the last expedient. King Alexander, however, did not declare his intention plainly, and Kolbein, tired of waiting, delivered up the letter, got that of king Hácon back, and thus rescinded the truce. He was escorted to the ships by two monks. Kolbein when reporting to king Hácon his proceedings, told him that Eogan of Argyll had earnestly tried to dissuade king Alexander from fighting with the Norwegians; it does not seem, however, that Eogan went back to Hácon according to his promise. This monarch now was greatly exasperated, and desired the Scottish monks, when returning, to tell their king, that he would very soon recommence the hostilities and try the issue of a battle.

[1] See Dillon, Arch. Scot. l. c.

Accordingly, king Hácon detached king Dugald, Alan Mac Rory his brother, Angus of Isla, Murchard of Kentire, and two Norwegian commanders, with 60 ships to sail into Loch Long and ravage the circumjacent parts, while he prepared to land himself with the main force at Largs, and fight the Scotch army. The detachment does not appear to have met with any serious resistance, all the Scotch forces being probably collected near Largs. The banks of Loch Lomond and the whole of Lennox were ravaged, Angus even ventured across the country to the other side, probably near Stirling, killing men and taking a great number of cattle. This done, the troops who had been on shore returned to the ships. Here, however, a terrible storm, which blew for two days (Oct. 1 & 2), wrecked ten vessels, and one of the Norwegian captains was taken sick and died suddenly [1].

Also the main fleet, off Largs, suffered greatly by the same tempest. It began in the night between Sunday (Sept. 30) and Monday (Oct. 1), accompanied by violent showers; a large transport vessel drifted down on the bow of the royal ship, swept off the gallion and got foul of the cable; it was at last cast loose, and drifted towards the island; but on the royal ship it had been necessary to remove the usual awnings or covers, and in the morning (Oct. 1) when the flood commenced, the wind likewise turned, and the vessel, along with another vessel of transport and a ship of war, was driven on the main beach, where it stuck fast, the royal ship drifting down while with five anchors, and only stopped when the eighth had been let go. The king had found it safest to land in a boat on the Cumrey with the clergy, who celebrated mass, the greater part believing that the tempest had been raised by witchcraft. Soon the other ships began to drift, several had to be cut away the masts; five drifted towards the shore, and three went aground. The men on board these ships were now dangerously situated, because the Scotch, who from their elevated position could see very well what passed in the fleet, sent down detachments against them, while the storm prevented their comrades in the fleet from coming to their aid. They manned, however, the large vessel, which had first drifted on shore, and defended themselves as well as they could against the superior force of the enemy, who began shooting at them. Happily

[1] H. H. S. Ch. 323.

the storm abated a little, and the king was not only able to return on board his ships, but even send them some aid in boats; the Scotch were put to flight, and the Norwegians were able to pass the night on shore. Yet in the dark some Scots found their way to the vessel, and took what they could. In the morning (Tuesday Oct. 2), the king himself with some barons and some troops went on shore in boats, to secure the valuable cargo of the transport, or what was left of it, in which they succeeded; now, however, the main army of the Scots was seen approaching, and the king, who at first meant to remain on shore and head his troops himself, was prevailed upon by his men, who feared lest he should expose himself too much, to return on board his ship. The number of the Norwegians left on shore did not exceed 1000 men, 240 of whom, commanded by the baron Agmund Krøkidans, occupied a hillock, the rest were stationed on the beach. The Scotch, it is related in the Saga, had about 600 horsemen in armour, several of whom had Spanish steeds, all covered with mail; they had a great deal of infantry, well armed, especially with bows and Lochaber axes [1]. The Norwegians believed that king Alexander himself was in the army; perhaps this was true; we learn, however, from Fordun, that the real commander was Alexander of Dundonald, the Stewart of Scotland. The Scotch first attacked the knoll with the 240 men, who retired slowly, always facing the enemy and fighting; but in retracing their steps downhill, as they could not avoid accelerating their movement as the impulse increased, those on the beach believed that they were routed, and a sudden panic betook them for a moment, which cost many lives, as the boats were too much crowded they sank with their load; others, who did not reach the boats, fled in a southerly direction, and were pursued by the Scotch, who killed many of them; others sought refuge in the aforesaid stranded vessel; at last they rallied behind one of the stranded ships of war, and an obstinate battle began; the Norwegians, now that the panic

[1] This weapon is called *sparða* in the Saga, i. e. the Irish *sparthe*, which, indeed, seems to have been nothing more than a lochaber axe, or at least very like it; from the Orkn. Saga and Olafs S. helga Ch. 94, we learn, that it was a kind of axe on a long shaft with a hook. A weapon of this kind in the hands of the Scotch from Ayrshire and the Highlands must have been Lochaber axes.

was over, fighting desperately. Then it was, that the young and valiant Piers of Curry, of whem even Fordun and Wyntown speak, was killed by the Norwegian baron Andrew Nicholasson, after having twice ridden through the Norwegian ranks. The storm for a while prevented king Hácon from aiding his men, and the Scotch, being tenfold stronger, began to get the upper hand; but at last two barons succeeded in landing with fresh troops, when the Scotch were gradually driven back upon the knoll, and then put to flight towards the hills. This done, the Norwegians returned on board the ships; on the following morning (Oct. 3) they returned on shore to carry away the bodies of the slain, which, it appears, they effected quite unmolested by the enemy; all the bodies were carried to a church, no doubt in Bute [1], and there buried. The next day (Thursday Oct. 4) the king removed his ship farther out under the Island, and the same day the detachment arrived, which had been sent to Loch Long. The following day (Friday Oct. 5), the weather being fair, the king again sent men on shore to burn the stranded ships, which likewise appears to have been effected without any hinderance from the enemy. On the same day he removed with the whole fleet to Lamlash harbour [2].

We have not deemed it superfluous to give here at some length these particulars of the celebrated battle of Largs, extracted from the plain narrative of the Saga, with a view of removing at least some of the erroneous and almost ridiculous ideas which have prevailed and still no doubt prevail about it in Scotland and England. We do not intend, however, to waste many words upon the insane belief of so many amateur antiquarians, that the expedition of king Hácon was not more or less than a piratical excursion in the old pagan Viking-style; that „*the warlike*“ [3] king Hácon was „the last of the Vikings“; and that

[1] It is afterwards related, that the body of Ivar Holm, the captain who died suddenly on the expedition of the Loch Long squadron, was carried to Bute and buried there, when this squadron returned; hence we may guess, that also the other bodies were buried on the same spot.

[2] H. H. S. Ch. 323—326.

[3] Thus he is styled by Lord Hailes, and we believe even by Sir Walter Scott in his History of Scotland. Hácon, however, although in his younger days he was compelled to some fighting, was by no means a warlike monarch, his merits (and he is indisputably the best king Norway ever had)

his men, who fell in the battle, were buried as pagans, inasmuch as the cairns, cromlechs, and other sepulchral monuments from the pagan times discovered at Largs have been invariably believed to belong to those christian Norwegian warriors, who fought on 1st and 2d of Oct. 1263 [1]; an error, the glaring enormity of which indeed even the most superficial knowledge of general history (not to speak of ecclesiastical history) might seem sufficient to expose, not to speak of the facts specially recorded, that the king brought bishops and clergymen with him, and that all the bodies of the slain Norsemen were removed from the spot [2]. Yet apart from this almost unaccountable hallucination, there are still serious errors left. Firstly, the exaggerated description given by Fordun [3] of the ravages, which the Norwegian fleet suffered

consisted chiefly in pursuits of peace, as legislative improvements,, founding of cities, promoting of useful knowledge, of trade etc.

[1] We quote here the words of Dr. Wilson in his Archæology p. 325, „A reference to the old and new statistical accounts of the various parishes, along both the Ayrshire and Argyleshire coasts, will suffice to shew that the battle of King Haco has proved as infallible a source of explanation for the discovery of cists, tumuli, cairns, and sepulchral relics of every kind, as if it were a well authenticated fact that no one had died, from the days of Noah to our own, but at the battle of Largs". Sir Walter Scott is seen to have participated in the same error, when writing his Marmion (Canto III., Not. 4), where the pagan relics found at Largs are attributed to the slain subjects of king Hácon.

[2] That the bodies were removed, is also expressly stated in the Melrose Chronicle, which, indeed, although making too much of the reverses suffered by the Norwegians in the battle, or rather omitting the fact, that the Scotch were finally driven back, does in the whole not diverge, more from the narrative of the Saga, than the difference of information and national feeling may account for; we give it here: *Anno domini 1263* (the old edition has erroneously 1262) *Haco Rex Norwagiæ cum cum copiosa navium multitudine venit per mare occidentale ad debellandum regem Scotiæ, sed re vera, ut ipse H. affirmabat, non eum repulit vis humana sed virtus divina, quæ naves eius confregit et in exercitum suum mortalitatem immisit; insuper et eos qui tertia die post sollemnitatem Sti Michaelis ad proeliandum convenerant, per pedissequos patriæ debellavit atque prostravit, quapropter coacti sunt cum vulneratis et mortuis suis naves suas repetere, et sic turpius quam venerant repatriare.* [3] Fordun, X. 16.

the storm had given rise to the belief, that king Hácon lost thousands of his men, and that, indeed, his power was entirely broken. Now everybody accustomed to use historical records will perceive at the first glance, that the narrative of the whole affair, as given in the Saga, does not admit of any serious doubt; the events being told minutely and candidly, without mincing or exaggerating; and, that it has been evidently written after the relation of eye-witnesses or participators, which, indeed, was very easy, as the author, Sturla Thordson from Iceland, finished the Saga two years afterwards [1]. There was no reason why it should not be stated, if more ships were lost than the six or seven here mentioned, or if more men were killed, than what we may calculate from the fact that at the highest estimation not more than 1500 could have taken part in the fight from first to last, the greater part of whom seem even to have survived. Indeed if the loss had been so great as Fordun intimates, the Saga had bewailed it, according to its wont, in quite other strains; and the movements of the king had been quite different. It is stated in the Saga [2], that when king Hácon was at anchor near Gigha, previous to his sailing round Kentire to Arran, there came a deputation to him from the Irish, offering him their allegiance if he would help them to throw off the English yoke; and that he so far showed himself favourable to their wish, that he sent a Sudreyan, named Sigurd, back with them to ascertain what inducements they might offer him. Now, during his stay in Lamlash harbour, after the battle, Sigurd returned from Ireland with the offer on the part of the Irish, that they would entertain his host the whole winter, if he would come and help them. And, it is said, he was greatly inclined to do so, but the army was averse to it, and as the wind happened to fail, while provisions began to be scarce, he gave up the plan. He could not, however, have entertained the idea for a single moment, if if he had really felt himself so weak, as must needs have been the case if the relation of Fordun were true. Moreover, we learn that the Scotch army did not prevent his men from removing their dead to the ships [3],

[1] H. H. S. Ch. 275.

[2] ib. Ch. 322.

[3] Dillon, in his treatise, taking it for granted that the Norwegians were disconfited, and that the Scots were masters of the field, cannot, of course,

nor even, two days afterwards, burning the stranded vessels; an ample proof that they had retired from the place, a fact which, partly at least, must have been due, to the valiant defence and real victory of the Norwegians; partly, perhaps, to the circumstance, that the news of the ravages committed by the other Norse detachment in Lennox etc., which could not have reached the king or the stewart till then, no doubt induced them to send troops to those parts; or perhaps even to hasten thither with the whole army. Lastly, we learn, that king Alexander did not retake a single island, but that king Hácon, on his return, disposed of Arran, Bute and even Donaverty without any hinderance. The tempests,

reasonably explain how the Norwegians were able to remove their dead, without supposing that a truce or convention for burying the slain had been concluded. Afterwards, he wonders, without being able to give any explanation, how they were allowed to destroy the ships. These facts, however, explain themselves sufficiently from the narrative in the Saga, without in the least calling for any necessity of supposing a convention to have been made. The fact was, simply, that the Scots had retired, and entirely left the field to the Norwegians. By a miscalculation, Dillon believes the day, when the stranded ships were destroyed, to be the 12th, instead of the 5th, of October: this indeed, must make the impunity with which the destruction was effected, seem still more unaccountable. The miscalculation arises from the Icelandic denomination of Thursday „*fimtidagr*“ (fifth day, *feria quinta*), which has caused many similar mistakes. The 3d of October was a Wednesday; on Thursday (Oct. 4), says the Saga, the king removed his ship farther out under the island; „*fimtadaginn*“, is here erroneously construed to be the fifth day after the 3d of October, i. e. the 8th of October; and when the Saga continues „on Friday, the weather being fair, the king sent men to burn the stranded ships“, this Friday is consequently believed to be the Friday after the 8th of October, i. e. 12th. Afterwards, the Saga itself says, that on Sunday, the 14th of October, (first in the winter), the king left Islasound, after a stay there of two nights; having previously stopped one night (the 11th) at Gigha, one (the 10th) at Sandey, one (the 9th) under Arran, and „some nights“ near Lamlash. — Although, as we have demonstrated, the Scotch cannot have been near, when the Norwegians removed the slain, and there was therefore nothing to prevent them from burying them near the church of Largs, still we cannot agree with Mr. Dillon in the supposition, that they did bury them there, as it is expressly stated, that the bodies were sent for from the fleet and consequently taken on board the ships, to be buried elsewhere, no doubt, as we have mentioned, in the Island of Bute.

of course, prevented the Norwegians from effecting any thing more than defending themselves, and repelling the hostile attack, no doubt with a comparatively serious loss; and they certainly compelled Hácon to desist for that season from farther undertakings, which in itself was a disaster; but so much is evident, that even if the ships had not been damaged and the battle had not taken place, the king would nevertheless have been obliged to retreat, as he did, and to put off active hostilities for the winter. It is, therefore, quite true, what Melrose chronicle quotes as his own words, „that he was driven back, not by human force but by the immediate influence of God."

When it had been determined, that no expedition should be undertaken to Ireland for the time being, the king held a meeting with his men, and declared, that he would return to the other Islands, because provisions were scarce [1]; he gave even some of the troops permission to return home to Norway, of which they were not slow to avail themselves. He left Lamlash about the 9th, passed the first night under Arran, the second under Sandey, the third under Gigha, and came on the 12th to Isla Sound, where he passed two nights, levying a contribution from the islanders of 360 neats, or their value, part of which was to be paid in meal and cheese. On Sunday, the 14th of October, he continued his course, but a violent tempest, accompanied by dense mists, forced him to seek shelter in the harbour of Kerrera. Here fresh negotiations passed between the king and Eogan, but without any effect; Eogan did not even present himself, and it was soon announced, that his men had committed ravages in the Isle of Mull, and killed some men, natives as well as Norwegians. Now, then, Eogan had finally declared himself for king Alexander. King Hácon did not, it appears, attempt to take any revenge, nor is it likely that it had been possible then to do so. From Kerrera the king sailed to the Calve of Mull, where king Dugald and his brother Alan Mac Rory took their leave; the king invested them with the lands formerly held by Eogan; moreover, he assigned to Dugald the castle of Donaverty in Kentire; to Rory be gave Bute, and to Murchard Arran. These were certainly not the acts of a vanquished monarch, and the Saga adds justly „then in this expedi-

[1] The Chron. of Melrose speaks also of „mortality" (meaning no doubt diseases) among the troops; very likely it may be right.

tion king Hácon had regained the territories which king Magnus Barefoot had gained from Scotland and the Sudreys. The king of Man with the other Sudreyans had returned home before this time. After a stay of some few days the king left the Calf of Mull, and proceeded to Rona, whence he took a northerly course, but was compelled by contrary winds to seek shelter for several days in Westernfirth (Loch Snizort) in Skye, whose inhabitants therefore were forced to contribute provisions. At last he was able to continue his course, and passed Cape Wrath, but off Diurness he was becalmed (Oct. 27), and entered a firth, called *Gjáfjorðr*, no doubt Loch Eribal, where seven of his men, who had gone on shore to fetch water, fell into an ambush and were killed. On Monday (Oct. 29), he crossed the Pightland firth to Ronaldsvoe, losing a ship in the Swelchie. When arrived the Orkneys, he found that the greater part of the ships had returned home to Norway, many without leave. He now determined to pass the winter at Orkney with 20 ships and all the barons, giving the rest leave to go home. Accordingly, he had the ships put on shore at Midland harbour and Scalpa in the Mainland, and took his residence in the palace of bishop Henry at Kirkwall. Here he was taken sick from over-exerting himself. We refrain from giving the interesting history of his sickness and death, as not touching the present matter, suffice it to say, that he died on the 15th of December, to the grief of all his subjects. In the following spring, as our chronicle rightly says, his body was carried to Norway, and buried in the Cathedral of Bergen, named Christ Church, or Trinity Church [1].

During his sickness, king Hácon seems to have reflected seriously upon the expediency of continuing the war, and indeed to have come to the resolution that now, when the military glory of the nation was secured, an honourable and lasting peace was greatly to be preferred to a long and obstinate war. We learn namely from the Saga, that early

[1] H. H. S. Ch. 326—330. We may add, however, for the benefit of those who speak of the „warlike“ king Hácon as of a Viking of the old fashion, whose men were buried under cairns and cromlechs, or in true pagan style, that during his sickness he had the bible and some legends read to him in Latin, until he found it too troublesome to follow the latin text; then the Sagas of his ancestors were read in his own tongue.

in the spring the barons and captains, left by him in the Orkneys, sent messengers to king Alexander, „to look about them whether peace might be concluded." Fordun says, that according to one tradition, Hácon before his death sent the letters, which he had got from the malcontents in Scotland, to Alexander, with warnings against the traitors; this, however, the author himself thinks improbable, inclining rather to believe another tradition, that after king Hácon's death the Norwegians wrote to king Alexander a letter under the late king's seal, in which they warned him against certain magnates, hoping that he would punish them and thereby weaken his own power, although they were innocent, and the aspersion was without the least foundation [1]. This version, however, seems no more probable than the former; yet it is not unlikely, that the message, by which this letter was sent, was the same as is spoken of in the Saga, especially as it is told, that the messengers, bishop Henry of Orkney and Ascatine, the royal chancellor, were very badly received; they were threatened, it is said, with death or imprisonment, and the Scots complained, that the Norwegians had ravaged more than a third of Scotland. It is obvious, that something more than the acts of open war must have taken place to exasperate the Scots so terribly; yet this whole affair is obscure, nor is it likely that it will ever be sufficiently explained. The messengers returned, and Sir Askatine went soon afterwards to Norway, whither also Sir Agmund Krökidans and Eric Dugaldsson had already repaired with some of the troops, reporting to the king, that the Scots were far from being inclined to peace; whereon the king immediately sent Sir Agmund and Eric back to Orkney, the former to take the chief command of the forces in Orkney, the latter, to proceed with three vessels to the Sudreys. Meanwhile, king Alexander prepared himself for the renewal of the war, and the cities, or some of them at least, furnished loans of money, which were spent not only in armaments, but also in bribes to several inhabitants of the Isles. The armament, it was said, was chiefly directed against king Magnus of Man, who dispairing of success while the Norwegian fleet was not at hand, sued for peace, and requested a safe conduct, that he might treat in person with king Alexander. The safe-conduct was granted, and king Alexander having repaired to Dumfries, Magnus met him

[1] Fordun X. 16. Also Wyntown VII. X. 215—234.

there, and submitted entirely to him, declared himself to be his vassal, and tending him the oath of allegiance, on condition, that the Scottish king should protect him, if the king of Norway sought to take revenge for this desertion; he promised, however, to furnish ten ships of war to the service of king Alexander. This is the relation of Fordun, which seems to be very accurate; according to our Saga [1], the Scots really „went to Man and compelled king Magnus to oaths of submission"; considering, however, the particular circumstances, the difference is very slight, and amounts almost to nothing; from Dumfries to Man there is only a short distance, and if the Scottish fleet was assembled near Dumfries, which it certainly was, it is not unlikely, that some of the ships should have shown themselves off Man, to intimidate Magnus. It is curious, that this whole transaction should not be mentioned by a single word in our chronicle. King Alexander also sent a considerable number of forces, commanded by Earls William of Moray and Alexander of Buchan, as well as by Alan Durward, to reduce the other islands, and as there were none or few Norwegian troops to protect them, this enterprize was successful: Angus of Isla, the Saga says, and many others, who had followed king Hácon the last year, now submitted to the Scots. Fordun adds, that „those traitors, at whose request king Hácon had come to the Isles, were now killed in battle, expelled, or hanged." Only king Dugald, the Saga relates, kept so well aloof on his ships, that they did not get hold of him. Lastly, king Alexander sent troops to Caithness, whose inhabitants were made to pay a heavy fine for having yielded to the necessity, when king Hácon compelled them to give contributions. This movement caused Sir Agmund, who dreaded an attack upon Orkney, to keep back Eric Dugaldson for the whole winter with the ships and troops intended for the Sudreys, which no doubt greatly accelerated the progress of the enemy there. The Orkneys, however, were not attacked, and when the Scots returned from Caithness, king Dugald attacked them, killed many of them, and took a great deal of goods. In the next spring (1265) he came to Orkney, soliciting aid, when his son Eric accompanied him with three ships, according to the royal order.

Meanwhile, king Magnus, hearing from the Chancellor how matters

[1] Saga of King Magnus, fragm. Ch. 4.

stood, ordered him to return immediately as ambassador to king Alexander, accompanied by two Franciscan friars, one of whom was brother Maurice, who afterwards was employed in other diplomatic transactions with Scotland [1]. They went to Scotland as soon as possible, and got access to the king; they were even more friendly received than the former messengers, yet they did not get any other answer, than this, that if king Magnus really wished for peace, he ought to send „good messengers [2] to Scotland next summer. Yet we learn from the Icelandic annals, compared with the Chamberlains Rolls, that Alexander indeed sent two Franciscan friars to Norway in the year 1264 [3], and it is very likely, that these friars accompanied their Norwegian brethren, who arrived, together with Sir Ascatine, at Throndheim, where the king had passed Yule time, in the month of January 1265. The king complied with the request of king Alexander, sufficient evidence of his eagerness for peace, and sent from Bergen, whither he had repaired after Easter time, bishop Gilbert of Hamar and Sir Ascatine [4], both Scotchmen born, to Scotland, with full power to treat for peace on the conditions which had been rejected by king Hácon the previous year, viz. that the Scottish king should have the Isles inside of Kentire, while all the rest should continue to belong to Norway. The ambassadors took their route through England, where they landed at Lynn, and thence proceeded to York. Here they remained for a while, no doubt prevented from getting farther

[1] Chiefly the marriage treaty of Roxburgh and Berwick 1282, Acts of Parl. of Scotl. I. p. .

[2] One of those „good messengers" being, as we see, Chancellor Ascatine, who had been so badly received when he went for the first time with bishop Henry of Orkney, we must infer, that king Alexander had particular objections to the latter.

[3] The Icel. annals say, that Alexander sent two Franciscan friars to Norway in 1264, in the Chamberlains Rolls the expenses of friars Malise and Alexander of Berwick, „who went beyond the sea on the king's errand" are calculated to 37 sh. 1 d. Archæol. Scot. II. p. 39.

[4] Saga of king Magnus, Ch. 4. Fordun, X. 19. The edition by Hearne has here, rightly, „*Rex Magnus misit Gilbertum episcopum de Hamar et suum Cancellarium*", which in the Goodall edition is wrongly given: „*R. M. misit suum Cancellarium dominum Gilbertum episcopum de Hamer*" as if both were one person.

by the war between the barons and prince Edward [1]. At last they penetrated into Scotland, and came to king Alexander; this monarch, however, who by that time must have pretty well completed the conquest of the Isles, treated their proposals with contempt, and insisted upon having all the Islands. The messengers now returned to Norway, yet king Alexander relaxed his obstinacy, in so far that he adopted a middle course, sending the eloquent Reginald of Roxburgh, monk in Melrose abbey, to Norway with the proposition to the king of selling Man and the Islands for a competent sum of money. This expedient had probably been concerted with the Norwegian ambassadors, who no doubt had likewise prepared their king for it, as it is related in the Melrose chronicle, which here may be assumed as the most authentic record, that Reginald was honourably received, that king Magnus called his magnates together, to consult about the matter, and that he said *quod multum expediret pro pace servanda, ut venderentur insulæ regi Scottorum*, to which some of the magnates objected, but that at last the opinion of the king was agreed to. These transactions, however, must have taken rather a long time, as Reginald did not return till the next year. The treaty, according to the chronicle of Melrose, was already got up and agreed upon in Norway, and carried to Scotland by Chancellor Ascatine, who departed from Norway shortly after Reginald [2]. This, howewer, cannot have been but the preliminary record, as we

[1] In the Saga it is expressly said, „They went first to England, to Lynn; at that time a great strife broke out in England, and Simon of Montfort was killed; the bishop and the chancellor then went to York, where they remained for a while."

[2] Here the learned editor of the Bannatyne edition of „Chronica de Mailros" has made a curious mistake. At the name of „*Reginaldus de Roxburgh*" he adds the following note: „The Norwegian account of this expedition, published by Johnstone, says simply, p. 15, that an archdeacon (erkidjakn einn) was sent from Alexander, and gives a different colouring to the whole transaction." Now, these words about the archdeacon belong to the 367 chapter of king Hácon's Saga, where the embassy sent from king Alexander to king Hácon in 1261 is spoken of. The transactions between Alexander and Magnus in 1265—66 have no doubt been related in the Saga of king Magnus, of which fragments only are left, and the part in question wanting.

learn from the final document, of which copies are still preserved, that it was written in Scotland, after the arrival of the Norwegian ambassadors, and that these were, as usually, two, Chancellor Ascatine and Sir Andrew Nicholasson, the same who killed Sir Piers of Curry in the battle of Largs. Of course the main contents of the treaty were already agreed upon in Norway, and the final transaction in Scotland was a mere formality, to obtain the ratification, yet the definitive record, written *in duplo*, one to be sealed by the Scottish king, and sent to Norway, the other, vice versa, to be sealed by the Norwegian king (the Chancellor had no doubt already brought with him a sealed blank for this purpose) and delivered up to king Alexander, dated at *Perth*, on Friday after the day of St. Peter *&* Paul, or July 2d, 1266. As it has been often printed, we do not deem it necessary to give it here at length, referring those who want to peruse it from beginning to end, to „Acts of Parliaments of Scotland, Vol. I. p. 78, 101; Torfæi Orcades, p. 198, his Historia Norwegiæ IV. p. 343; Peterkin's Rentals of Orkney, Johnstone's Antiq. Celto-Normannicæ, p. 52, etc. It is sufficient to say, that king Magnus ceded to king Alexander the Isle of Man and all the Sudreys, but not the Orkneys and Shetland, which were expressly excepted, without depriving the Norwegian Archbishop of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction and metropolitan rights over Man and the Isles; Alexander promising in return, that the crown of Scotland should perpetually pay to the crown of Norway annually 100 Marks Sterling, in the Cathedral of Kirkwall, not later than the 1st of July; and besides, a sum of 4000 Marks Sterling, by four instalments of a thousand each, in the years 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, at the time and place aforesaid; finally, that a fine of 10000 Mks Sterling was to be paid by the party who violated or did not fulfil the treaty to the other, both submitting to the jurisdiction and ecclesiastical punishment of the apostolic See [1]. Immediately after the conclusion of this treaty, the

[1] The words, in which the Melrose chronicle gives the contents of this treaty, is rather remarkable: „*cuius compositionis hæc est summa annua, scilicet quod rex Scotiæ omni anno in perpetuum dabit regi Norwagiæ centum libras sterlingorum pro cognitione homagii facti regi Norwagiæ a dicto Alexandro rege Scotiæ, qui ad majorem securitatem præ manibus pacavit regi Norwagiæ 4000 marcarum.*

Norwegian ambassadors, it appears, returned home, as we learn from the Icelandic annals, that king Magnus published the treaty at a public meeting in the Christ-churchyard in Bergen on the day of St. Lawrence (Aug. 10) the same year. In the inventory of the public records existing in the treasury of Edinburgh castle a. d. 1282, published in Acts of Parl. of Scotl. p. I. preface p. 3. we find among „*negotia tangentia Norwagiam*" not only „*Compositio inter reges Scotiæ et Norwagiæ super insulis, duplicata*", i. e. the treaty itself, with a copy, but also „*Confessio procuratorum missorum a regi Norwagiæ pro dicta compositione facienda*", and farther „*mandatum regis Norwagiæ quod insulæ faciant homagium regi Scotiæ et ei intendant ut domino*"; it appears, then, that king Magnus of Norway, as usual in such cases, had issued a document, in which he released his Sudreyan subjects from their allegiance, and transferred it to the king of Scots; no doubt the ambassadors brought this letter with them fully prepared under his seal [1]. When the treaty was concluded, king Magnus of Man was already dead, as we see from our chronicle [2], yet king Alexander did not come into possession of Man — if, indeed, he ever did — without difficulties. According to Fordun, who, however, wrongly assigns the death of king Magnus to a. d. 1267, king Alexander in this year collected an army against the „rebels" of Man, with the intention of establishing his camp there; yet he altered this plan, and sent only some of his troops with the Galwegians. The result is not mentioned, but there can be no doubt that we have it somehow given in the titles of two letters, mentioned in the aforesaid inventory, viz. a letter to king Alexander from the „*Majores*" of Man, no doubt a limited and conditional submission, and an obligation of Alexander to the bishop of Man „*quod non iret super Manniam ad tempus*", evidently the condition, on which the Manx magnates agreed to acknowledge him for their liege Lord. King Alexander probably now exacted oaths of

[1] Among these *negotia tang. Norwagiam* also three other records, touching the Isles, are named, but which probably belong to the 12th century: viz. a royal donation to Russin abbey, a royal letter about Bute and other islands, granted the king of Man, and another royal letter about the islands Juist and Egyn (Eigg).

[2] In the Icelandic annals, the decease of Magnus is wrongly referred to a. d. 1266, and by Fordun to 1267.

allegiance from the Sudreyans in general, and especially from those magnates who had not yet submitted to him. Among the last to do so, it appears, was Angus of Isla, because from the same inventory we learn, that the barons of Argyll pledged themselves, under the loss of their hereditary domains, to aid the king faithfully against Angus, if he did not obey the king's commands, and that Angus was compelled to issue an obligation, tendering forfeiture of his patrimonial domains, if he failed in his duty towards the king. Afterwards, however, we find him among the Magnates of Scotland, f. inst. at the parliament of Scone 1283 (*Acts of Parl.* I. p. 82). His descendants, the Mac Donalds, were likewise a powerful clan. Whether king Dugald Mac Rory did homage to king Alexander, is not known; from the Icelandic annals we learn, that he died already in 1268, and it is very likely, that he passed these last two years after the cession, in Norway, since his death is noticed by the Icelandic annalist; and since his son, Sir Eric Dugaldson, continued to live in Norway as a baron, till his death in 1287 [1]. The brother of Dugald, however, Alan Mac Rory, submitted to the king of Scots; he appears as *Alanus filius Roderici* among the barons of the parliament of Scone, 1283.

Since the conclusion of this treaty, the Norwegian dominion of Man and the Isles ceased entirely, and no formal attempt was made to gain it back, although it would seem, that the wish was not entirely given up, especially by the son and successor of king Magnus, *Eric*, who possibly married the daughter of Alexander chiefly for this purpose [2]. Yet we learn from our chronicle, as well as from Fordun, and the title of the above mentioned document, that the dominion of Alexander in the Isle of Man must have been rather loose and much disputed by the natives themselves. Indeed, the Island seems never to have been formally united with Scotland, but only to have been held by Alexander and his successors as a personal possession, which afterwards facilitated

[1] It is worth to observe, that in the Saga of king Magnus written about 1270, Dugald is no more styled king, but only Lord Dugald. The title had evidently been antiquated, or dropt.

[2] In the marriage treaty of Roxburgh and Berwich, a. d. 1281, king Alexander pledged the Isle of Man as security for the payment of the fine (100,000 £ St.) in case of his not fulfilling the stipulations.

its transference to the Crown of England. Of this, however, it is superfluous and beyond our scope to treat here. We learn from the chronicle of Lanercost, although, by a singular mistake, it mentions the cession of Man during a. d. 1256, while the battle of Largs is spoken of during a. d. 1266, that king Alexander really, for a time at least, had bailiffs or lieutenants in Man. The article being curious, and somehow a supplement to our chronicle, we give it here a length: *Eodem anno* (1256), *adhuc Ywaro* (the assassin of Reginald, here, however, king Magnus is evidently meant) *Manniam gubernante, translatum est regnum Manniæ et Insularum ad Alexandrum regem, filium Alexandri regis Scotorum, ex consensu et bona voluntate Magni regis Norwegiæ filii Haconis, conventione tamen de annuali censu reddendo regi Norvegiæ et heredibus suis. Rex autem constituit ballivos suos in Mannia, quorum primus fuit Godredus Mac Mares, post hunc Alanus filius Comitis, post hunc Mauricius Okarefair, post hunc Reginaldus capellanus domini regis.*

That Magnus of Man was married to a daughter of Eogan of Argyll, and that she afterwards married Malise Earl of Stratherne, has been already mentioned. We can hardly think this connexion with Eogan to have been without influence upon Magnus, in hastening his submission to king Alexander, in 1264, as well, perhaps, in making his fidelity to king Hácon rather shaky already in 1263, when Eogan had declared himself peremptorily for Alexander.

P. 27. *Anno d. 1275.* According to the Chronicle of Lanercost, the expedition here mentioned, was caused by a new rebellion of the Manxmen, who had taken Godred, the son of Magnus, for their king. We give the entry at length, as a supplement to our Chronicle: *Hoc anno* (*1275*) *septima die mensis Octobris, applicuit navigium regis Scotiæ in portu de Reynaldsway. Statim dominus Johannes de Vesci*[1] *et optimates regis cum exercitibus suis in insulam Sti Michaelis ascendebant, Mannensibus paratis ad proelium, cum Godredo filio Magni, quem paullo ante regem constituerant sibi. Magnates vero et capitanei regis Scotiæ legationem pacis ad Godredum et populum Manniæ transmiserunt, pacem dei et regis Scotiæ eidem offerentes, si a stultissima præsumtione sua desisterent, et se ultro regi*

[1] This Johannes de Vescy is called in the Chron. de Mailros, a. d. 1268, „*dominus burgi de Alnewike*" and founder of the Premonstratensian Monastery of Alnwick.

et optimatibus suis dederent. Godredo autem et perversis quibusdam consiliariis suis legationi pacis non consentientibus, sequenti die ante solis ortum, cum adhuc tenebræ essent super terram, et corda stultorum hominum obtenebrata essent, conflictus factus est, et miseri Mannenses tergà vertentes miserabiliter corruerunt. If Godred, as it would seem, was among the slain, the male line of the Godredian dynasty expired in his person. The female line seems to have survived for one generation more. In the year 1293, namely, one Affreca, related to the last king, Magnus, and pretending to be his legal heir, claimed the Isle of Man, as we learn from a letter issued June 15, 1293, by king Edward I. to John Baliol, then king of Scotland, citing him as a vassal of the English crown, to appear before his court, and receive judgment in the same case. It must be added, that the Island had been lately made over by Edward to king John (see letter, dated January 5, 1293, Rymeri foed. I. 9. p. 785), the inhabitants having three years before (Rymer. l. c. p. 740) of their own free will put themselves under the protection of king Edward. This Affreca was no doubt a grand-daughter of her namesake, the daughter of king Godred mentioned heretofore (p. 15. ad ann. 1204) in her marriage with John de Courcy, and named after his grandmother, as she again in her turn was named after her grandmother, Affreca of Galloway, king Olaf's Queen (vid. p. 7 ad ann. 1102). What was the issue of the lawsuit, we do not know, nor do we think it necessary to dwell on the entries in our Chron. for the years 1313 and 1316, as being sufficiently explicit to want any explanation.

P. 28. *Hi fuerunt episcopi* etc. When comparing the list of the bishops given here with those mentioned by English annalists and in the Icelandic annals, we perceive in the beginning a difference of statements, sufficient to make it evident, that indeed sometimes there have been two or three bishops at once. As for „Roolwer" (*Hrólfr*), whose name shows him to have been of Norwegian origin, and his three successors, of whom nothing more is known than what is said here, they stand without rivals, the other records not mentioning any bishop so

far back. The first mentioned in the Icelandic annals is Ragnaldus or Reginald (*Reinardus*) whose death is recorded for the year 1170, but while our chronicle makes Reginald to be succeeded by Christinus of Argyll, Christinus by Michael, who died 1193 (p. 15) and Michael by Nicholas, who died 1217 (p. 16), the Icelandic annals say expressly, that after the death of Reginald there was no bishop for 40 years, when, a. d. 1210, a bishop was consecrated, named *Koli.* In some manuscripts of the annals „Reinardus" is corrupted into „Nemar", and it is even recorded, that this Nemar was taken prisoner. On the other side, we learn from Stubb's *Acta pontiff. Eboracens.* (Twysden p. 1217), compared with Matthew of Paris, William of Newbury etc. that Wimund, the same who afterwards stepped forth as a pretender to the Scottish crown, under the name of Malcolm Mac Heth, but being then priest in Skye was consecrated bishop by Thomas, Archbishop of York, who died a. d. 1114; and that he was succeeded by John, monk from Savigny (Matth. Par. p. 60); John, as it appears from king Olaf's letters, printed in our Notes above p. 76—77, being again succeeded by a Nicholas, monk in the abbey of Furness, about 1130, as it is to Archbishop Thurstan (1119—1139) that king Olaf applies for his consecration, while the monastery itself had existed only since a. d. 1126. It appears therefore, that Wimund, John and Nicholas must have been contemporary with William and Gamaliel, perhaps even with Reginald mentioned in our chronicle; and that Christinus, Michael and Nicholas of our Chronicle were contemporary with the long vacancy and Koli of the Icelandic annals, whom we believe to be the same as Nicholas (this name being sometimes abridged to Colas, Claus etc.) This confusion is to be regarded as a product of many factors. To resolve the riddle, it is first of all necessary to distinguish between the period before the erection of the metropolitan See of Nidarós by the bull of Pope Anastasius IV in 1154, when the Sudreys were expressly annexed to this province as a suffragan diocese, and the times subsequent to the said bull. Before this arrangement, Man at least was evidently regarded as belonging to the province of York, and perhaps also the other Isles, as, indeed, was the whole of Scotland, at least according to the pretensions of the archbishop of York; but it is very probable, that Man and the Isles had not

always one bishop in common, but either of them one of their own [1], and moreover, that here, as in Norway before 1111, no distinct bishopricks with fixed residences existed; but that the bishops were only ambulatory, or court-bishops. From the letter of Pope Innocent IV, which we have reprinted in the appendix No. 8, we see that the monks of Furness abbey in Yorkshire asserted the right of electing the bishops of Man from their own number, which right may be they founded upon the agreement recorded in the letter of king Olaf I., which we have given pag. 76, although from the fact, that previous to the election here spoken of, one bishop at least was taken from the monastery of Savigny, the mother of Furness, the right of election seems already to have been exerted by this monastery, and to have been transferred to the daughter abbey, when that was founded in 1126. It is, however, very probable that the agreement mentioned in the aforesaid letter was never meant to establish a general rule for the time to come, but only to arrange the election for the present occasion, and the election of Wimund and John had been arranged in a similar manner — a connexion, the cause of which we do not presume to investigate, having evidently sprung up between Savigny abbey and the royal family of Man —; and that the king and people never thought of giving up their right of the electing of bishop in common, since indeed, as we shall see by and bye, they asserted that right even in later days, and with final success. Now it is very likely that the archbishop of York, declaring this manner of election to be uncanonical, pretended that the right of election belonged to himself and his chapter, because Man had no chapter of its own, and that he even made use of this right: indeed, the letter of king Olaf to the chapter of York (p. 76—77) alludes evidently to an unwillingness on the part of the latter to acknowledge the election of Nicholas. We think, therefore, that Gamaliel, who must have been contemporary with John and Nicholas, was named by archbishop Thurstan especially, as he is expressly said to have been an Englishman, and buried at Peter-

[1] From the letter of Innocent IV., issued a. d. 1247 to a chieftain in Kentire (appendix No. 9), we learn, that then the diocese of Argyll was called *diocesis Lismorensis;* Lismore being one of the Isles, it is not unlikely that the diocese comprehended some more of these in former times.

borough, while Wimund, being formerly priest in Skye, was rather bishop of the Isles, and not of Man.

When the metropolitan see at Nidaros was erected, the pretensions of the Archbishop of York as to the jurisdiction over Man and the Isles must necessarily have come to an end, or ought at least been cancelled, while it appears that the archbishop and chapter of Nidaros now asserted the right of electing the bishops to all those suffragan sees of the province which had no chapters of their own, viz. Skálaholt and Hólar in Iceland, Garðar in Greenland, the Færeys, and of course also the Sudreys, which right, indeed it succeeded in establishing in the four first-named dioceses, where hitherto, at least in Iceland, the election had been used to be effected almost in the same manner as in Man. In the Isles, this pretension must evidently have occasioned new differences. The fact, that Ragnald or Reginald was a Norwegian, and is mentioned first of all Sudreyan bishops in the Icelandic annals, shows clearly, that his nomination was due to the authority of the Nidrosian see, and that we ought to date it from a. d. 1152, when the See was founded, and all these matters arranged by Cardinal Nicholas Brekspere, afterwards to be sanctioned by the papal bull. And when we remember, what has been shown before, that just at that time king Godred was in Norway, suing for support and submitting himself and his possessions entirely to the Norwegian crown, which indeed was evidently the cause why the Sudreyan See was made a suffragan to that of Nidaros, we may easily account for the fact, that the authority or pretensions of this See were then acknowledged and obeyed for the nonce, and it is even very probable, that Godred himself brought Reginald out with him, when he returned to Man in 1153. The statement, that Reginald made an important arrangement with his flock about the episcopal revenues, seems also somehow to bear witness of his having exercised a no small degree of influence and probably enjoyed the protection of the king. Yet when Godred was expelled by Somerled of Argyll in 1158, it is very likely that Reginald shared his fate, and followed him to Norway [1], which supposition is greatly corroborated

[1] If there is some truth in the above mentioned statement, found in some manuscripts of the Icelandic annals, that Reginald, or, as he is called, Nemar, was taken prisoner, this corroborates our opinion; it being then

and grows almost to certainty by the fact expressly stated in our chronicle, that Christinus who is said to have succeeded him, was an Argyll-man, evidently a protégé of Somerled and introduced by this usurper. It is not very likely that Christinus was consecrated by the archbishop of York; he must rather be supposed to have come from Ireland, since he was buried at Benchor abbey in Ulster, of which he probably was a monk. Of course, under these circumstances Christinus could not be acknowledged as the right bishop by the Norwegians, and this accounts for his not being mentioned in the annals. We are rather inclined to think, that Reginald did not return from Norway, but remained there tell his death in 1170. When Christinus then, as we do not doubt, was in his turn expelled by Godred after the fall of Somerled, it is to be supposed, that Godred, who did not care much for his allegiance to Norway, when not pressed by sheer necessity, proceeded to arrange an election after the old fashion, since it is expressly stated that Michael, the elected, was a native of Man. There can be no doubt, that he was consecrated by the archbishop of York, from his being buried at Fountain abbey, to which congregation he must have belonged, and this circumstance explains very well, why he too was not acknowledged by the Norwegians or mentioned in the Icelandic annals. He is said in our chronicle to have died a. d. 1193, yet as the same year is also affixed to the preceding entry, about the captivity of king Richard, there is a strong presumption that the repetition is wrong and that we ought to read 1203, especially as it is immediately followed by an entry of a. d. 1204. In this case, the bishop, who is said in the Saga of bishop Gudmund to have been with king Olaf in one of the islands south of Lewis, when Gudmund and Rafn Sveinbjarnarson arrived there in 1202 on their way to Norway, must have been this Michael; if, however, Michael died in 1193, that bishop was his successor Nicholas. Yet as Nicholas, like Christinus, was an Argyll-Man and was buried at Benchor in Ireland, we are rather inclined to think that he belonged to this monastery and that his nomination happened during the affairs which king Reginald had with Ireland in 1204 and 1205. As there can scarcely be any doubt, that he was the identical person, who

evident, that he was taken prisoner by Somerled, who perhaps afterwards permitted him to go to Norway, on the condition of not returning to the Isles.

is called Koli in the Icelandic annals, his consecration, we see, must have been deferred till a. d. 1210, and it must have been celebrated by the Norwegian archbishop, or with his permission, because otherwise he would hardly have been mentioned in the said annals or acknowledged as bishop more than his predecessors, the episcopates of whom are regarded as a blank of 40 years. It was no doubt chiefly on account of the confusions here mentioned, that Pope Innocent III, at the request of archbishop Eric at Nidaros, issued a brief in the month of February a. d. 1205, by which he declared, that the bishops who belonged to the province of Nidaros, ought to be consecrated by him and his successors only, and by no other bishop, except when the metropolitan See was vacant, yet even then not without the consent of the Nidrosian chapter; the suffragan sees subjected to that of Nidaros being, next the four in Norway proper, those of the Orkneys, Sudreys, Færeys, Iceland and Greenland.

This declaration, however, was not observed for any length of time, as already Reginald, who succeeded Nicholas in 1217, was no doubt a monk of Russin, since he was buried there, and Russin being a daughter of Furness, the monks of this abbey probably now again exerted their pretended right, whence it follows, that Reginald was consecrated by the archbishop of York; this is also corroborated by his not being mentioned in the Icelandic annals, and consequently, as we must infer, not acknowledged by the Nidrosian See. His successor John, of whom nothing else is known, seems likewise, to infer from his burial place, to have been consecrated at York. It was not till the consecration of his successor Simon, that the metropolitan rights of the Nidrosian See commenced to be duly respected and obeyed for a longer period. As Simon was consecrated in 1226, the time of the successive episcopates of Reginald and John added together cannot have exceeded nine years.

P. 29. *Jacet apud Jerewos in Anglia*] The name „Jerewos“ seems to be a corruption of „Jernemuthe“, Yarmouth.

P. 29. *Post hunc Symon Erchadiensis*] We learn from the Icelandic annals, that Simon was consecrated in the year 1226, and as his consecration is mentioned together with that of Árne, bishop of Bergen, Orm of Oslo, and Askel of Stavanger, it is to be inferred that they were consecrated all four on one day by archbishop Peter of Nidaros,

who had just arrived from Rome with the *pallium* at the close of the preceding year [1]. The Saga of king Hácon relates, that in the autumn of 1226 bishop Simon, John Earl of Orkney, and the abbot of Iona met king Hácon in Bergen, and treated of some important affairs with him; the archbishop having been there a little before the king's arrival; it is therefore, very likely, that the consecration of Simon had been celebrated while the archbishop made his stay in Bergen [2]. There can be no doubt, that Simon, whose promotion happened shortly after the victory of Olaf in 1224, was a protegé of this king, and that accounts very well for his being consecrated in Norway, although he was an Argyll-Man; since it was the policy of Olaf and his followers, always to look for support from Norway against the party of Reginald, and consequently to maintain the Norwegian interests and the rights of the Norwegian crown in Man and the Isles. The important affairs of which Simon and the abbot of Iona had to treat, were perhaps the defection of the Manxmen from Reginald in 1226, and their homage to Olaf as sole monarch.

It is mentioned here as well as above p. 23, that Simon built the church of St. German, i. e. the cathedral of Man and the Isles, at Holm Peel. And immediately afterwards, p. 23, the first mention is made of a chapter with the right of election, and an archdeacon. As it is certain, that no chapter existed before, it is evident, that this important institution was founded by Simon, and closely connected with the erection of the new Cathedral [3]. It was no doubt the intention of Simon to consolidate the diocese, and to prevent for times to come either the detaching of the northern Isles, or the interference of the monks of Furness, or of the archbishop of York, in the election and consecration of the future bishops. In so far, this arrangement was quite in the interest of Norway, and may therefore have been suggested during his stay there at his consecration. Indeed, the metropolitan jurisdiction of

[1] Hák. Hák. Saga Ch. 131.

[2] Ibidem, Ch. 147.

[3] As a farther proof of the ecclesiastical zeal of Simon, we add that there exists yet a record of statutes, enacted on a diocesan ecclesiastical convent held by him a. d. 1229; the statutes are printed in Concilia Magnæ Britaniæ ed. Wilkins I, 664.

the Nidrosian archbishop appears now to have been thoroughly established and acknowledged in Man, no doubt through the exertions of king Olaf and his party; the most remarkable evidence of that fact being this, that even the abbot of Icolmkill, who might have claimed exemption at least from the supremacy of the bishop, repaired to Norway in 1226, thereby practically acknowledging his dependency, and afterwards, as we shall see next (we do not know whether it was the same or his successor), when appearing at the papal court, must have acknowledged himself to have come „ex partibus Norwegiæ.“ In the beginning of the year 1244, when Simon perhaps was already expected soon to die, the monks of Furness, as we learn from the papal letter of Febr. 16. 1244, printed in the appendix as No. 8, made one last attempt to obtain from the recently elected pope Innocent IV a confirmation of their pretended right to elect the bishop from themselves, but evidently not with the expected or wished for success. In their remonstrances with the pope, of which the letter gives the contents, they used, as we see, a great deal of cunning and sophistry, blending true assertions with false ones, and especially taking care not to characterize the see with any other name than with that of *Man*, hoping no doubt thereby, and by carefully avoiding that of the Sudreys (*eccles. Sodorensis*), to make the Pope believe that the see in question was another than the latter, and that he might confirm their claim without contradicting former regulations. The Pontiff, however, although maybe not aware of the identity of the *ecclesia Mannensis* with the *ecclesia Sodorensis*, was too wary to grant the request unconditionally; it is even not unlikely that he had been warned by the intriguing abbot Björn of Holm in Norway, who happened to be in Rome at that time. We learn, that he granted their request, which purposed to secure not only to themselves the right of electing, but also to the archbishop of York the right of consecrating the bishop, on condition, however, that matters were really as they alleged, and that the Norwegian archbishop had no objection, about which a letter was simultaneously directed to that prelate. The result is not expressly told, but as there cannot be the least doubt, that the archbishop of Nidaros objected to it and protested with all his

might, the whole matter had necessarily to be dropt, nor is there any sign of its having ever been revived [1].

It is said p. 23, that bishop Simon died in 1247, which agrees very well with the statement p. 29, that the see was vacant after his death for about 6 years; it being quite certain from the Saga, as well as the papal letter, printed in the appendix No. 12, that his successor was inaugurated in 1253. It is, however, added immediately afterwards p. 23, that Simon died in the 18th year of his episcopate, which does not agree with his being consecrated in 1226, 21 years before 1247. If then the number is not a mere blunder, we cannot explain this apparent inaccuracy otherwise than by supposing, that Simon had been prevented by the troubles between king Olaf and his brother Reginald from taking his see at Man in possession till after the death of king Reginald in 1229. As a further confirmation of his decease having happened in 1247, we may, perhaps, regard the fact, recorded in the papal letter to the abbot of Iona, dated Apr. 22, 1247, and printed for the first time in our appendix as No. 10; viz. that this abbot repaired personally to the pope at Lyons, to present his compliments, and obtain the grant of using episcopal *insignia* under some limitations, as it is most likely, that for requesting such a privilege he chose expressly the time, when the episcopal see was vacant, and when there were none to make objections. We learn, also, that the request was granted. In the Icel. annals, the decease of Simon is wrongly referred to a. d. 1249.

When the abbot of Iona, as we learn from the letter just mentioned, visited the pope at Lyons, and obtained the right to wear the episcopal mitre and ring, there can be no doubt, that it was also he who got the letter of protection to Dugald, Lord of Machumel in Kentire, dated only four days before, which is given in the appendix No. 9, not because there is anything remarkable in the general contents, but chiefly because Kentire is said here to belong to the diocese of Lismore, more generally called the diocese of Argyll; the former deno-

[1] Shortly before the successor of Simon, Richard, was consecrated by archbishop Serlo, a. d. 1253, the foundation bull of the metropolitan See of Nidaros was renewed in extenso and confirmed by Innocent III. (Dipl. Norv. III. 3.), and here the Sudreyan Isles are expressly named.

mination appearing to contain some reminiscences from the times, when the Isles had not their bishop in common with Man.

P. 30. *Post Symonem vero etc.*] Here the whole transaction is omitted, which has been mentioned above in the chronicle of the king, p. 23, and which accounts for the long vacancy after the decease of Simon. It appears, that the recently founded chapter had excercised for the first time its right of election, choosing their archdeacon, Lawrence, for his successor, but that the whole clergy and the people, unwilling to forego their ancient privilege of electing the bishops in common, had protested against transferring it to the body of canons in a letter sent to king Harold, who happened to be in Norway, and that Harold, siding with the protestants, denied his assent to Lawrence, until the election had been repeated in the ancient manner. There seems, however, not to have been any doubt, that the election of Lawrence would be confirmed, but this was never to happen, as Lawrence shared the melancholy fate of the king and his queen, who were drowned in Sumburgh Roost on their return to the Isles a. d. 1248. It is not explained, why the see still continued vacant for about five years, yet we may guess with pretension almost to certainty, that the right of election continued some time to be a matter of dispute between the chapter and the other party, especially as we learn from the letter of Innocent IV, given in the appendix as No. 12, that Richard, the final successor of Simon, was named by provision, a rather unfailing sign in those times of the election having been disputed and protracted beyond the proper time. It is also related in the Saga of king Hácon, Ch. 276, that the Nidrosian archbishop Sörli or Serlo, who had been elected a. d. 1252, and had repaired to Rome, as usual in order to be confirmed by the Pope, consecrated afterwards during his stay there two of his suffragans, Peter, bishop of Hamar, and Richard of Sudrey. From our Chronicle we learn, that Richard was an Englishman, from the papal letter (No. 12), that he was chaplain to the Cardinal John of St. Lorenzo in Lucina, and canon of St. Andrews in Scotland, likewise, that he was not immediately nominated by the Pope himself, but at his order by the archbishop. The circumstance, that the letter to the chapter of Sudrey is only accompanied hy one to the clergy in general, and one to the people, but none to the king, although it was usual to address the king, particularly on such

occasions, may be accounted for by what is known from our chronicle, that Magnus was not duly installed as king till in the course of 1253, while the papal letter is dated the 14th of March in the same year. As Richard was consecrated in 1253, and died in 1274, on his return from the general council of Lyons, he did not fill the See, as our chronicle says, for 23 years, but only 21. The name of his dying place, Langalyver in Copland, we have not been able to find on the maps. Yet it must have been somewhere near Furness abbey, since he was buried here.

P. 30. *Post hunc Marcus etc.*] We learn from the Icelandic annals, that Marcus was consecrated by the archbishop of Nidaros in the city of Tunsberg, in the south of Norway, a. d. 1275. Afterwards we learn from the Saga of the Icelandic bishop Árni, that Marcus was in Norway a. d. 1280, and no doubt present at least at the first sittings of the provincial council, then held in Bergen by archbishop John. But no clue is given to explain the fact, mentioned by our chronicle, that he was expelled by the Manxmen for some time and that the island in consequence was subjected to interdict for three years. We may venture to suggest, that the dispute between the chapter and the people and clergy of Man not yet being ended, but only suspended by the provisional nomination of Richard, Marcus had been elected by the chapter, and of course confirmed in his dignity and consecrated by the Norwegian archbishop, but on his return in 1275 had been rejected by the other party, and that he did not return and has not been acknowledged by his flock till 1280, having, perhaps, meanwhile personally visited the papal See in 1277, to make his complaints and obtain the decree of interdict, and spent the rest of his exile in Norway. The frequent change of handwriting in these entries testifies their having been added successively by contemporaneous writers. If Marcus, as it is said, was bishop for 24 years, he must have died in 1299 [1].

P. 30. *Post hunc Alanus etc.*] Of the four bishops here enumerated, Alan, Gilbert, Bernard and Thomas, we have not found anything else-

[1] There exists also a record of council statutes, enacted by Marcus, see Monasticon Anglicanum and Langebek Scr. R. D. III. Marcus likewise was présent at the great parliament held in Berwick in the summer of 1292, to settle the claims of the different pretenders to the crown of Scotland; Marcus was one of the judges named by John Baliol. Rymer. I. 2. p. 755.

where, and therefore know nothing about their election and consecration, except what is said in general, p. 31, that they were all consecrated by the archbishop of Nidaros. That some vacancies must have occurred between their respective episcopates, and therefore, perhaps, the above mentioned dispute may have continued, appears from the circumstance, that the $2^1/_2$ years of Gilbert, the 4 of Bernard, and the 18 of Thomas, in all $24^1/_2$, do not fill up the gap of $28^1/_2$ years between the death of Alan, on the 15th of February, 1320, and that of Thomas, on the 20 of Sept. 1348.

P. 30. *Wilhelmus Russell.*] The letters of pope Clement VI, by which the election of William was confirmed, are still preserved in the papal Registers, and we have given at length in the appendix (No. 17) that addressed to the archbishop of Nidaros, from which we learn, that the cause, why the confirmation and consecration were not given by the latter, is by no means to be ascribed to any intention of the Pope to detach the Sudreyan See from the *Provincia Nidrosiensis*, or give any prejudice to his metropolitan rights but, only to the circumstance, that this episcopate, as all others, or in general all ecclesiastical benefices, had been reserved by the Pope for his own provision, wherefore, at this period, we find in Registers an immense number of similar provisions, which were indeed as many encroachments upon the rights of the legal electors and disponents, and, when regarding episcopates, generally accompanied by „*permissiones redeundi*", showing that the consecration has been given at the papal See, not by the proper metropolitan. In this manner, also the present letters are followed by a *permissio redeundi* (No. 18), dated May 6, 1349, from which it appears, that William was consecrated by the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, not, as it is stated in our Chronicle, by the pope himself. By comparing the date of both letters, we learn that the consecration must have taken place between the 27th of April and the 6th of May. The letter of confirmation apprizes us of the important fact, that the dispute between the chapter and the people and clergy must at last have been ended in favour of the latter party, if not indeed, the chapter had been entirely dissolved, which we might be induced to believe from the fact, that none of the copies are addressed, as usually, to the chapter, this being not at all mentioned. If such a dissolution had happened, it must have been after 1320, in

which year an archidiaconus Sodorensis, by the name of Cormac, is mentioned in a letter issued by archbishop Eilif at Nidaros (Bartholiniana E. p. 134). It would even seem from the fact that William had been formerly abbot of Russin, that the pretensions of Furness had somehow again been revived. The three last copies show, that at that time William of Montague was the chief Lord of Man, and that he, Robert the Steward, Lord of Bute, and his son-in-law John Mac Donald of Isla, great-great-grand-son of Reginald Mac Somerled [1] were the three most powerful Lords in the diocese. As No. 19 and 20 we give two other letters, which show that William did not return from Avignon till after the 14th of June, 1349, and that he must have had some influence with the Pope in obtaining not unimportant grants, especially that of encumbering his church and see with a mortgage. From the letter of pope Urban V, dated Dec. 7. 1367, which is given in the appendix as No. 28, we learn, that then there was a question, at the request of the Franciscan Provincial of Ireland and the said William of Montague now Earl of Salisbury, about erecting a Franciscan convent in the Isle of Man, which, however, does not seem to have been put into execution.

P. 31. *Obiit autem etc.*] The date and year are so precisely stated, along with the time of his episcopate and the consecration of his successor, that there would seem to be no occasion for doubt as to the accuracy thereof. Still it is strange, that in the papal letter of provision, dated on the 26th of May 1377, which is given in the appendix No. 36, William is spoken of without the usual addition for the deceased, of „*bonæ memoriæ*". This omission, however, cannot be but a mere occasional blunder.

P. 31. *Pridie mensis Junii etc.*] The day is rightly described, the 31th of May a. d. 1374 being just the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. This John Doncan was previously archdeacon of Down and nuncius and collector of the papal revenues in these parts, as appears from the letters given in the Appendix No. 29. What our Chronicle says about his election and confirmation, is not quite according to the truth, in so far as the Pope did not properly confirm his election, but appointed him *proprio motu* by way of provision, without regarding his election otherwise than as a mere recommendation. All this appears from the papal

[1] See Genealogical Tables.

letter of provision, which we give here at length, with all the usual accompanying letters of recommendation (these, of course, only in extract), vid. Appendix No. 34. The date of the provision, however, or, as it is styled in our Chronicle, the confirmation, is rightly said here to be St. Leonard's day or the 6th of November. From the accompanying letter to the archbishop of Nidaros in Norway (Thrond) we learn, what is exceedingly interesting, that even so far down as 1374, his metropolitan supremacy over the bishop of the Sudreys was acknowledged by the *Curia;* the Sudreyan church being expressly characterized as „*suffraganea tua*". How long it still continued as such, we are not able to say from want of documents, yet there is every reason to believe, that in the papal chancery nothing was altered in this respect, at least down to the time, when the See of St. Andrews was elevated into a metropolitan one by pope Sixtus IV in 1472; for in several lists of archiepiscopal Sees, with their respective suffragans, dressed in the 15th century, and preserved in the Vatican archive, the *Episcopus Sodorensis* is always referred to as suffragan to the *Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis.* — Among the accompanying letters one is directed to king Robert Stewart of Scotland, the same to whom, as Lord of Bute, a simular letter was addressed when William, the predecessor of John Doncan, was appointed bishop in 1349. Another letter, containing *verbotenus* the same, is addressed to „King William of Man" (*Wilhelmo regi Minaviæ*), the particulars of which, however, we must leave to our English readers to supply. — The cardinal, who consecrated bishop John, was Simon de Langham or Longam, who had previously been prior and abbot of Westminster, then successively bishop of London, of Ely, chancellor, archbishop of Canterbury (in the text of our Chron. „*Cantuariensem*" is distorted into „*Carocuviacum*"), cardinalpriest of St. Praxede or St. Sixtus, legate in England and France; in 1373 he was promoted to the Cardinal-bishoprick of Præneste, and died in Avignon on the 22d of July, 1376 (Ciaccone, II. 568). Why bishop John, as it is stated in the last words of our Chronicle, was arrested in Boulogne and kept as prisoner for more than a year, as it appears, we are not able to tell; maybe there was something the matter about his collecting-business, which he no doubt did not execute to the pleasure of all parties. Even the successor of Gregory XI, Urban VI, was not satisfied with his behaviour, as ap-

pears from the letter given in the Appendix No. 37. Curious it is, that shortly after his deliverance, Pope Gregory in a letter of provision issued to a Sudreyan clergyman, Malcolm son of Isaiah, dated May 26, 1377, the predecessor of John, bishop William, is mentioned without the usual addition for deceased persons, of „*bonæ memoriæ*", as if he were still living (Appendix No. 36). This however, must be regarded only as an error of omission, as bishop John must have been too well acquainted with the Pope, that the latter should have forgotten the particulars about his accession.

We wind up these notes subjoining some, hitherto unknown, supplements to the knowledge of the Metropolitan Supremacy of Nidaros over Man and the Sudreys. In a manuscript codex [1] written in the 15th century, „*liber censuum Romanæ ecclesiæ*", composed by Cencius Camerarius a. d. 1192, but with additions of later dates, showing that it has been kept *à jour* with all subsequent alterations, we read fol. 44, under the superscription „Norwegia":

> „In archiepiscopatu Nidrosiensi — In episcopatu Bergensi — In episcopatu Stauuengrensi — In episcopatu Hamarensi — In episcopatu Asloensi — In episcopatu Horchadensi — In episcopatu *Sudereiensi*, alias *Manensi* (to which is added: *Ecclesia Sancti Columbi de Insula Hy .ii. Bisancios annuatim*) — In episcopatu Scalotensi in Islandia – In episcopatu Holensi in Islandia — In episcopatu Pharensi in Grotlandia [2] — In episcopatu Gardensi in Grotlandia."

In another Manuscript codex [3], written about a. d. 1400, or perhaps later [4], containing first an alphabetical list of all existing bishoprics, with the taxation of their revenues, referred to their respective

[1] Ms. cod. in the Vatic. Archive.

[2] This means, of course, Greenland, but is, as everybody sees, a mistake.

[3] Ms. cod. likewise in the Vatic. Archive.

[4] As the See of St. Andrews in Scotland is always spoken of here as an archbishopric, it might be fair to conclude that the book was written after the erection of this See to an archiepiscopate by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1472, but the hand-writing has evidently an older character, and that denomination might possibly be a blunder, of which there are more than one in the book, especially as to the spelling of the names.

metropolitan provinces; then a similar list of all monasteries, and finally a „*Provinciale omnium mundi Ecclesiarum Patriarchalium, Metropolitanarum et Episcopalium,*“ i. e. a list of the Sees, systematically enumerated under their respective metropolitans, without addition of the taxes, the Sudreyan See is mentioned, in the first list, under the letter S, in these words:

Sodorensis in Noruegia et prouincia Nidrosiensi, floren. vj.c lx. (660); in the third, fol. 53 recto, the list of Norwegian bishoprics begins with the words *Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis hos habet suffraganeos;* then follow first those in Norway proper, and Greenland, next to them „Olorchadensem uel Orkadensem, Scorensem (i. e. Sodorensem) uel Insulanum, prope Scociam est“ — then those of Iceland, while no mention is made of Man or the Sudreys under the „archiepiscopus Eboracensis“ or „archiepiscopus Sancti Andree“.

APPENDIX.

No. 1. (December 9, 1203.)

Innocentius episcopus s. s. dei dilectis filiis Celestino abbati Sancti Columbe de Hy Insula eiusque fratribus tam presentibus quam futuris religiosam uitam professis in perpetuum salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Religiosam uitam eligentibus apostolicum conuenit adesse presidium, ne forte cuiuslibet temeritatis incursus aut eos a proposito reuocet aut robur, quod absit, sacre religionis eneruet. Eapropter dilecti in domino filij, uestris iustis postulationibus clementer annuimus, et prefatum monasterium Sancti Columbe, in quo diuino mancipati estis obsequio, sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus et presentis scripti priuilegio communimus, in primis siquidem statuentes, ut ordo monasticus, qui in eodem loco secundum deum et beati Benedicti regulam institutus esse dinoscitur, perpetuis ibidem temporibus inuiolabiliter conseruetur. preterea quascunque possessiones, quecunque bona in presentiarum iuste et canonice possidetis aut in futurum concessione pontificum, liberalitate regum, largitione principum, oblatione fidelium, seu aliis iustis modis, prestante domino, poteritis adipisci, firma uobis uestrisque successoribus et illibata permaneant. In quibus sub propriis duximus exprimenda uocabulis. locum ipsum in quo prefatum monasterium situm est cum omnibus pertinentijs suis. ecclesias de Insegal. de Mule. de Coluansei. de Cheldubsenaig. de Chelcenneg. et de Jle. Jnsulas Hy. Mule. Coluansei. Oruansei. Canei. et Calue. Terra de Magenburg. de Mangecheles. de Herilnean [1]. de Sotesdal. Terras Abberade in Yle. de

[1] Aut „Herilneam."

Markarna. et de Camusnanesre [1]. Sane noualium uestrorum que propriis sumptibus colitis, de quibus aliquis hactenus non percepit, siue de uestrorum animalium nutrimentis nullus a uobis decimas exigere vel extorquere presumat. Sepulturam quoque illius loci liberam esse decernimus, ut eorum deuotioni et extreme uoluntati, qui se illic sepeliri deliberauerint, nisi forte excommunicati et interdicti fuerint, aut etiam publici usuarij, nullus obsistat, salua tamen iustitia illarum ecclesiarum, a quibus mortuorum corpora assumuntur. Obeunte vero te nunc eiusdem loci abbate uel tuorum quolibet successorum, nullus ibi qualibet subreptionis astutia seu uiolentia preponatur, nisi quem fratres communi consensu vel fratrum pars consilij sanioris secundum dei timorem et beati Benedicti regulam prouiderint eligendum. Ad indicium autem huius a sede apostolica protectionis percepte duos bizantios gratis oblatos solueris nobis nostrisque successoribus annuatim. Decernimus ergo ut nulli omnino hominj liceat prefatum locum temere perturbare aut eius possessiones auferre vel ablatas retinere, minuere, seu quibuslibet uexationibus fatigare, sed omnia integra conseruentur, eorum, pro quorum gubernatione et sustentatione concessa sunt, usibus omnimodis profutura, salua sedis apostolice auctoritate et diocesanorum episcoporum canonica iustitia. Si qua igitur in futurum ecclesiastica secularisue persona huius nostre constitutionis paginam sciens contra eam temere uenire temptauerit, secundo tertioue commonita, si non reatum suum congrua satisfactione correxit, potestatis honorisque sui dignitate careat reamque se diuino iudicio existere de perpetrata iniquitate cognoscat et a sacratissimo corpore et sanguine dei et domini redemptoris nostri Jhesu Christi aliena fiat atque in extremo examine districte ultioni subiaceat. Cunctis autem eidem loco sua iura seruantibus sit pax domini nostri Ihesu Christi, quatinus et hic fructum bone actionis percipiant et apud districtum iudicem premia eterne pacis inueniant. Amen. Amen. Amen. Datum Agnanie per manum Johannis Sancte Romane ecclesie subdiaconi et notarij .v. Jdus Decembris Jndictione .vij. Incarnationis dominice anno m^{o}cc^{o}iij^{o}. pontificatus uero domini Innocentij pape .iij. anno sexto. (Regest. Innocentii III. T. II. ann. 6. ep. 180. Arch. secr. Vatican.)

[1] Aut „Camusnamesre."

No. 1. b. (May 16, 1212.)

Omnibus Christi fidelibus, præsentem cartam inspecturis, Reginaldus Rex Insularum, salutem. Sciatis quod deveni homo ligius domini Regis Angliae Johannis contra omnes mortales quamdiu vixero, et inde ei fidelitatem et sacramentum præstiti. Et in hujus rei testimonium hanc chartam meam inde feci. Testibus, Domino P. Winton' episcopo. W. comite Sarum. G. filio Petri comite Essex. S. comite Winton'. Willielmo Briwerr. Guarino filio Geroldi. Apud Lameh', xvj. die Maij.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. p. 105.)

No. 2. (September 24, 1219.)

Rex omnibus ballivis et fidelibus suis has litteras inspecturis, salutem. Sciatis nos suscepisse in salvum et securum conductum dilectum et fidelem nostrum Reginaldum Regem de Man, et homines suos, quos secum duxerit, per totam potestatem nostram, in eundo versus terram suam de Man. Et ideo vobis mandamus, firmiter præcipientes, quod nec eidem Reginaldo Regi de Man, nec suis, malum, dampnum, aut impedimentum aliquid faciatis, aut fieri permittatis. Durabit autem conductus iste usque ad instans natale Domini, anno regni nostri quarto. Et in hujus rei testimonium, etc. Teste domino Petro Wintoniensi episcopo, apud Novum Templum London, vicesimo quarto die Septembris, anno, etc. tertio. (Rymer Foedera I. 1. 156.)

No. 3. (September 24, 1219.)

Rex omnibus, ad quos præsentes litterae pervenerint, salutem. Sciatis quod dilectus et fidelis noster Reginaldus Rex de Man venit ad fidem et servitium nostrum, et nobis homagium suum fecit. Et ideo vobis mandamus, quod in terram ipsius Reginaldi Regis de Man salvo et secure veniatis, et negotia vestra ibidem expediatis, quamdiu fuerit ad fidem et servitium nostrum. Et in hujus, etc. Teste ut supra, anno, etc. tertio. (Rymer l. c.)

No. 4. (April 12, 1228.)

Olavus Rex Manniae et Insularum habet litteras de salvo conductu veniendi in Angliam, cum hominibus suis quos secum duxerit, pro pace formanda inter ipsum, et Reginaldum fratrem suum. Duraturas a festo sancti Michaelis, anno regni nostri duodecimo, usque in xv. dies. Teste Rege, apud Westmonasterium, xii. die Aprilis, anno regni nostri xii.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 190.)

No. 5. (April 13, 1235.)

Rex omnibus ballivis et fidelibus suis, etc. salutem. Sciatis quod recepimus in salvum et securum conductum nostrum dilectum amicum nostrum Olavum, Regem Manniae et Insularum, in veniendo in Angliam ad loquendum nobiscum, ibi morando et inde recedendo. Et ideo vobis mandamus quod prædicto Regi et hominibus suis, quos secum duxerit in veniendo in Angliam, ibidem morando, et inde recedendo, sicut prædictum est, nullum faciatis, aut fieri permittatis impedimentum, dampnum, aut gravamen. In cujus rei testimonium has litteras nostras fieri fecimus, duraturas usque ad festum sancti Petri ad vincula. Anno regni nostri decimo nono. Teste Rege, apud Windesor', decimo tertio die Aprilis. Per ipsum Regem. (Rym. Foed. I. 1. 207. Langeb. Scr. III. 280. not.)

No. 6. (July 11, 1235.)

Rex dilecto et fideli suo M. filio Geroldi, justiciario suo Hiberniae, salutem. Sciatis nos dedisse, et carta nostra confirmasse dilecto et fideli nostro Olavo, Regi Manniae et Insularum, pro homagio suo et servitio custodiendi, ad custum suum, costeram maris Angliae versus Hiberniam, et versus insulam de Mannia, et similiter costeram maris Hiberniae versus Angliam, et versus prædictam insulam de Man' ne dampnum prædictis terris nostris Angliae et Hiberniae, pro posse suo, per mare in costeris illis possit evenire, quadraginta marcas, et centum crannocos frumenti, et quinque dolia vini, singulis annis percipienda in terra nostra Hiberniae, ad terminum Paschae, per manus justiciarii nostri Hiberniae,

quamdiu prædictus Rex Manniae bene et fideliter nobis serviret, prædictas costeras custodiendo. Et ideo vobis mandamus, quod prædictas quadraginta marcas, et prædictos centum crannocos frumenti, et prædicta quinque dolia vini, singulis annis ei habere faciatis, sicut prædictum est; incipientes primum terminum ad Pascha proximo venturum, anno regni nostri xx. In cujus rei testimonium has litteras nostras patentes vobis mittimus. Teste Rege, apud Westmonasterium, undecimo die Julii.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 218. Langebek III. 230.)

No. 7. (May 24, 1236.)

Rex omnibus ballivis et fidelibus suis, præsentes litteras inspecturis, salutem. Sciatis nos suscepisse in protectionem et defensionem nostram homines, terras, res, redditus, et omnes possessiones dilecti et fidelis nostri Olavi Regis Manniae et Insularum, qui, pro negotiis suis, ad partes Norwegiae de mandato Regis Norwegiae profecturus est. Et ideo vobis mandamus quod homines, terras, res, redditus, et omnes possessiones ipsius Regis Manniae et Insularum manuteneatis, protegatis, et defendatis. Nullum ei inde inferentes, etc. Et, si quid ei inde fuerit forisfactum, etc. Teste Rege, apud Merewell, vicesismo quarto die Maii.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 227. Langebek III. 231.)

No. 8. (February 16, 1244).

Innocentius episcopus . . archiepiscopo Eboracensi. Ex parte dilectorum filiorum abbatis et conventus monasterii de Furnesio Cistercien. ordinis Eboracensis diocesis fuit propositum coram nobis, quod licet ipsi, ad quos solummodo ius eligendi episcopum in ecclesia cathedrali de Mannia de antiqua et approbata consuetudine hactenus pacifice observata pertinet, virum idoneum ad eam quotiens ipsam vacare contingit eligant in pastorem, pro eo tamen quod electum ipsum oportet cum ad suam consecrationem accedit, quem interdum Eboracensis, alioquin vero Nidrosiensis archiepiscopus consecrare pro varietate temporum consvevit, mare periculosum et longum non absque apparenti et inevitabili dispen-

dio transmeare, vix aut nunquam inveniunt qui prebere velit, pro eo maxime quod ecclesia Nidrosiensis multum est ab eadem ecclesia periculosissimi maris interiectione remota, electioni de se facte consensum, sicque prefata ecclesia remanens occasione huiusmodi viduata, sustinet maximum in spiritualibus detrimentum. Quare prefati abbas et conventus nobis humiliter supplicarunt, ut ne pro defectu pastoris gregem dominicum lupus rapax invadat, obviare tanto discrimini paterna providentia curaremus. Quia vero ex huiusmodi vacationibus gravia dampna consveverunt ecclesiis provenire, fraternitatem tuam rogandam duximus attentius et hortandam per apostolica tibi scripta mandantes, quatinus, si est ita, de assensu venerabilis fratris nostri [Sigurdi] archiepiscopi Nidrosiensis, cui super hoc dirigimus scripta nostra, quotiens tibi electionem presentari ab eisdem contigerit, ipsam, si eam inveneris canonice de persona idonea celebratam, confirmare ac electo munus consecrationis impendere non postponas. Datum Laterani xv. Kal. Martii, anno primo.

(Diplomatarium Norvegicum I. No. 28.)

No. 9. (April 17, 1247).

Innocentius etc. Duibgaldo domino de terra Machumel in Kyntire Lismorensis diocesis salutem. Sacrosancta Romana ecclesia etc. personam tuam cum omnibus bonis que impresentiarum racionabiliter possides, sub beati Petri et nostra proteccione suscipimus et presentis scripti pagina communimus, districcius inhibentes, ne quis te in deuocione sancte Romane ecclesie persistentem super eisdem bonis temere molestare presumat. Nulli ergo etc. — Datum Lugduni .xv. kal. Maii pont. nostri anno quarto.

(Reg. Innoc. IV. in Arch. secr. Vat. ann. IV. ep. 522.)

No. 10. (April 22, 1247.)

Innocentius episcopus seruus seruorum dei dilecto filio Abbati venerabilis monasterij sancti Columbe Ordinis sancti Benedicti Sodreyensis diocesis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. A longinqua nobis Norwegie regione in qua tuum sicut asseris est monasterium constitutum

personaliter ad presentiam nostram accedens, tibi ac monasterio ipsi ad eiusdem decorem super quibusdam insignibus ecclesie dignitatibus a nobis gratiam exhiberi suppliciter postulasti. Cum igitur Romana ecclesia sibi subiectis humiliter uenientibus ad eandem consueuit esse pie matris affectu fauorabilis ac benigna, et dignum existat, ut tanti labor itineris munere compensetur gratie specialis, tue deuotionis supplicationibus inclinati tibi et successoribus tuis anuli et in diuinis officiis, diebus, horis ac locis competentibus, mitre usum, quodque in predicto et alijs monasterijs ordinis beati Benedicti ac etiam ecclesiis secularibus monasterio memorato subiectis Clero et populo, legato sedis apostolice aut archiepiscopo vel episcopo non presente, benedictionem possis dare sollempnem, auctoritate presentium duximus concedendum. Nulli ergo etc. nostre concessionis etc. Datum Lugduni. kal. Maii pontificatus nostri anno quarto. (Regest. Innoc. IV. in arch. secr. Vatican. an. IV. ep. 551.)

No. 11. (December 28, 1249).

Rex omnibus, salutem. Sciatis quod licentiam dedimus dilecto et fideli nostro Artaldo, illustri Regi de Mannia, veniendi ad nos in Angliam, ad loquendum nobiscum, et faciendum nobis quod facere debet. Et ideo vobis mandamus quod ei Regi, in veniendo ad nos in Angliam, vel ibi morando, vel inde redeundo, nullum faciatis aut fieri permittatis dampnum, injuriam, molestiam, aut gravamen; vel etiam hominibus suis, quos secum ducet. Et, si quid eis forisfactum fuerit, id eis, sine dilatione, faciatis emendari. In cujus etc. duraturas usque ad festum sancti Michaelis, anno regni nostri xxxiv. Teste Rege, apud Winton', xxviii. die Decembris. (Rymer Foedera I. 1. 272.)

No. 12. (March 14, 1253.)

Innocentius episcopus seruus seruorum dei dilectis filijs capitulo ecclesie Sodorensis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Racionis oculis intuentes comoda que uacantibus ecclesijs de salubri prouisione proueniunt, reddimur corde soliciti, ut circa prouisionem huiusmodi faciendam fruc-

tuose attentionis studium habeatur. Sane Sodorensis ecclesia pastoris solatio destituta venerabilis frater noster Serlo Nidrosiensis archiepiscopus loci metropolitanus de mandato nostro Richardum tunc capellanum dilecti filii nostri Johannis tit. sancti Laurentii in Lucina presbyteri Cardinalis, Canonicum Sancti Andree in Scotia, cui testimonium perhibetur quod sit in spiritualibus et temporalibus circumspectus, prefecit eidem ecclesie in episcopum et pastorem, ac ei apud sedem apostolicam munus consecrationis impendit. Rogamus itaque uniuersitatem vestram et hortamur attente, per apostolica vobis scripta mandantes, quatinus eundem episcopum ad ipsius ecclesiam accedentem admittentes illariter(!) et honorifice pertractantes, sibi tanquam patri et pastori animarum uestrarum impendatis obedientiam et reuerentiam debitam, ac eius salubribus mandatis et monitis efficaciter intendatis, alioquin sententiam etc. Datum Perusii, ii. id. Mart. pontificatus nostri anno xmo.

In eundem modum clero ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis.

In eundem modum populo ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis.

(Registr. Innoc. IV. in arch. secr. Vatic. ann. X. ep. 545.)

No. 13. (March 23, 1262).

Rex Angliæ Regi Scotiæ salutem et sinceræ dilectionis affectum. Accedens ad nos Johannes de Londors, clericus et nuncius vester, negotia, quæ sibi per vos fuerant injuncta, nobis laudabiliter exposuit et diligenter; quibus auditis et plenius intellectis, ea jussimus expleri, prout ipse vobis referre poterit viva voce. Scripsimus namque Regi Norwagiæ pro nunciis vestris vobis remittendis, et pro facto quod vertitur inter vos et ipsum. Similiter etiam domino Papæ pro vestris negotiis scripsimus, veluti pro nostris. Pro facto autem ecclesiæ de Salkhull, ad nos vocari fecimus episcopum Karliolensem usque ad unum mensem post pascha futurum, ut negotio, quod inter vos agitur, per viam pacis seu justitiæ, quatenus poterimus, consilium apponamus. Cæterum, quia vestra negotia nostra non minus reputamus, et in hiis, quæ vel ad securitatem vestram, vel ad commodum pertinent, vestris desideriis annuere vellemus, libenter præfatum nuncium vestrum nobiscum tam diu retinuimus, ut vobis solutionem illius pecuniæ, quam satis nostis, si ad hoc

nobis via pateret, fieri provideremus. Verum quia pro variis et urgentibus negotiis nostris, quæ vos credimus non latere, multa nos oportuit effundere, et impensas intolerabiles facere anno præsenti, nec exitus seu proventus, nobis debitos, recepimus, prout temporibus aliis fieri consuevit; et insuper cum jam dilecto nobis Alexandro, senescallo Scotiæ, de quingentis marcis, nomine vestro, satisfecerimus prout rogastis (per quod nobis pecunia non extat ad manus) sinceritatem vestram requirimus et rogamus, quatenus molestum non habeatis, si vobis, ad præsens, non satisfecimus de pecunia supradicta; et quia nollemus vobis terminum vel terminos ulterius assignare, nisi eos observari faceremus in totum, rogamus ut unam medietatem pecuniæ prædictæ in festo sancti Michaelis proximo futuro, et aliam medietatem ad Pascha, absque mentis vestræ tædio vel gravamine, recipere velitis; hujusmodi nobis rogatum concedendo benigne, quia terminos prædictos vobis faciemus modis omnibus plenius observari. Teste Rege, apud Windlesoram, xxiii die Martii.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 417.)

No. 14. (November 15, 1262.)

Henricus, Dei gratia, Rex Angliae, Dominus Hiberniae, egregio principi H. eadem gratia, Regi Norwegiae illustri, salutem et felices ad vota successus. Literas vestras, nuper nobis transmissas, benigne recepimus, ut decebat, ex quarum tenore perpendimus, quod vestrae non extitit voluntatis exercitum ducere in regnum Scotiae: vel aliquam guerram movere regi Scotiae, affini nostro karissimo; nec etiam nuncii ejusdem Regis, in terra vestra arestati, contra honestatem regiam tractati fuerunt, sicut ex gravi querela quorundam nobis extitit plenius intimatum; super quo mansuetudinem regiam plurimum commendamus. De eo etiam, quod eosdem nuncios, ad preces ipsius Regis, liberari fecistis liberaliter et benigne, sicut in prædictis literis vestris perpendimus contineri, serenitati vestrae gratiarum referimus actiones. Et quia nollemus, sicut nec deceret, aliquam dissensionis materiam inter vos, et præfatum Regem suboriri, sed potius pristinae dilectionis foedera, inter progenitores vestros, et suos dudum inita, ad honorem Dei, necnon et utriusque regni commodum et quietem, in posterum feliciter continuari; præfatum

Regem Scotiae rogabimus, et diligenter inducemus quod, si per ipsum, vel suos, dampnum, vel injuria vobis, vel vestris fuerit illata, vobis ea, qua convenit, amicitia et vicinitate faciat emendari. Quapropter serenitatem vestram rogandum duximus cum affectu, quatenus erga præfatum Regem et gentem suam tam curialiter et modeste vos habere velitis, quod mutuo honori vestro conveniat, et circumspectionem vestram pacificam merito commendare possimus. Teste meipso, apud Rem', xv die Novembris, anno regni nostri quadragesimo septimo.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 422.)

No. 15. (1263.)

Venerabili viro, et amico reverendo, domino W. de Merton, cancellario domini Regis, suus R. de Nevill, salutem, et paratam ad beneplacita voluntatem. Literas domini Regis nuper recepi, continentes quod me capitaneum suum constituit in comitatibus suis ultra Trentam, ad pacis suae conservationem contra quosdam rebelles suos, ac pacis suae perturbatores; et insuper custodiam comitatus Eborum, et castri ejusdem michi commisit; quae quidem in omnibus pro viribus adimplere paratus sum. Verum, quia talia assumere non possum, sine maximis sumptibus, dilectioni vestrae dignum duxi supplicare, quatenus, si placet, consilium vestrum et auxilium præsens domino Regi velitis apponere, ut michi significet ubi, et de quo sive de quibus, potero denarium perquirere ad custodiam tam comitatus et castri prædictorum, quam castri de Bamburgh', quod in mea est custodia, faciendam. Dicitur enim pro certo quod Rex Dacyae, una cum Rege Norewaijae, cum magna multitudine navegii, in forencisis insulis Scotiae applicuit; set quo proponant divertere nondum certum, unde periculum in partibus illis eminere formidandum. Dilectioni etiam vestrae significo, quod quidam, quos fideles domini Regis esse credebam, jam per prædicationem suorum rebellium ad ipsos penitus sunt conversi; propter quod majus auxilium aliorum perquirere, majoresque sumptus facere oportebit. Valeat semper in domino.

(Rymer Foedera I. 1. 429.)

No. 16. (April 27, 1349.)

Clemens episcopus s. s. dei dilecto filio Willelmo electo Sodorensi salutem et cetera. Apostolatus officium, quamquam insufficientibus meritis nobis dispositione superna commissum, quo ecclesiarum omnium regimini presidem utiliter exequi adiuuante domino cupientes mente reddimur uigiles et solertes, ut cum de ipsarum ecclesiarum regiminibus agitur committendis, quantum ab eo permittitur, cuius uices gerimus in terris, eis in pastores tales preficere studeamus, de quibus, consideratis uirtutibus de super sibi traditis, presumimus uerisimiliter et tenemus, quod creditas sibi animas uerbo instruere debeant pariter et exemplo, et ecclesias eorum commissas custodie spiritualiter et temporaliter augmentare. Olim siquidem ecclesia Sodorensis per obitum bone memorie Thome episcopi Sodorensis, qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum, pastoris solatio destituta, dilecti filij Clerus ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis, ad quos electio episcopi Sodorensis cum pro tempore imminebat facienda de antiqua et approbata et hactenus pacifice obseruatata consuetudine dicitur pertinere, die ad eligendum prefixa ut moris est conuenientes in vnum, spiritus sancti gratia inuocata, te tunc abbatem monasterij de Russin ordinis Cisterciensis Sodorensis diocesis quasi per inspirationem diuinam in episcopum Sodorensem vnanimiter et concorditer elegerunt, et electionem huiusmodi fecerunt populo solenniter publicari, tuque presentate tibi electioni huiusmodi ad instantiam predictorum cleri prius a dilecto filio . . . abbate de Furnesio dicti ordinis Eboracensis diocesis patre abbate dicti et de Russi monasteriorum superiore tuo super hoc petita et obtenta licentia consensit, in hijs omnibus statutis a iure temporibus obseruatis, et deinde tu dubitans quod prouisio ipsius ecclesie esset dispositioni apostolice reseruata, propter hoc ad sedem eandem personaliter accessit, et huiusmodi electionis negotium proponi fecisti in consistorio coram nobis, et ipsius electionis nobis presentato decreto a nobis suppliciter postulasti ut electionem huiusmodi confirmare de benignitate apostolica dignaremur. Nos igitur electionem ipsam, tueque persone merita per venerabilem fratrem nostrum Petrum Episcopum Penestrinum et dilectos filios nostros Guillelmum tit. sanctorum Quatuor coronatorum presbyterum, et Galhardum sancte Lucie in Silice diaconum cardinales examinari fecimus diligenter, et facta nobis ab eisdem episcopo Penestrino ac cardinalibus super hijs relatione plenarie (sic) et fideli, quia

predictam electionem inuenimus de te uiro religionis honeste, uite laudabilis, literarum scientia predito ac morum honestate decoro, in spiritualibus prouido et in temporalibus circumspecto, canonice celebratam, electionem ipsam non obstante si eiusdem ecclesie Sodorensis prouisio per nos vel predecessores nostros Romanos Pontifices eidem sedi sit specialiter uel generaliter reseruata, de fratrum nostrorum consilio auctoritate apostolica confirmauimus, teque ipsi Sodorensi ecclesie in episcopum preficimus et pastorem, curam et administrationem ipsius ecclesie tibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo, firma spe fiduciaque conceptis quod ipsa ecclesia Sodorensis, dextera domini tibi assistente propitia, per tue industrie et circumspectionis fructuosum studium regetur utiliter et prospere dirigetur. Jugum itaque domini tuis impositum humeris prompta deuotione suscipiens et suavi eius oneri humiliter colla flectens, curam et administrationem predictas sic geras sollicite, fideliter et prudenter, quod ipsa ecclesia gubernatori prouido et fructuoso administratori gaudeat se commissam, ac bone fame tue odor ex laudabilibus tuis actibus latius diffundatur, tuque proinde preter eterne retributionis premium nostram et dicte sedis benedictionem uberius consequi merearis. Datum Auinione .v. kal. Maij pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

In eodem modo Dilectis filijs clero ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis salutem et cetera apostolatus *et cetera usque* dirigetur. Quocirca vniuersitati uestre per apostolica scripta mandamus quatinus eidem electo tanquam patri et pastori animarum uestrarum humiliter intendentes et exhibentes ei obedientiam et reuerentiam debitam et deuotam ipsius monita et mandata salubria curetis deuote suscipere et efficaciter adimplere, alioquin sententiam quam idem electus rite tulerit in rebelles ratam habebimus et faciemus auctore domino usque ad satisfactionem condignam inuiolabiliter obseruari. Datum *ut supra.*

In eo. mo. Dilectis filijs Populo Ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis salutem etc. Apostolatus *et cetera usque* dirigetur. Quocirca *et cetera usque* quatinus eundem electum tanquam patrem et pastorem animarum uestrarum suscipientes deuote, et deuota honorificentia prosequentes, ipsius monitis et mandatis salubribus humiliter intendatis, ita quod ipse in uobis deuotionis filios et uos in eo per consequens patrem inuenisse beniuolum gaudeatis. Datum *ut supra.*

In eo. mo. Venerabili fratri Arnoni Archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi salutem etc. Ad cumulum tue cedit salutis et fame si personas ecclesiasticas presertim pontificali dignitate preditas diuine propitiationis intuitu oportuni presidij et fauoris gratia prosequaris. Olim siquidem *et cetera usque* dirigetur. Cum igitur ut idem Wilhelmus electus in commissa sibi ecclesie Sodorensis predicte cura facilius proficere valeat, tuus fauor sibi esse noscitur plurimum oportunus, fraternitatem tuam rogamus et hortamur attente, per apostolica tibi scripta mandantes, quatinus ipsum electum et ecclesiam Sodorensem predictos iure metropolitico tibi subiectos habens pro nostra et ipsius sedis reuerentia propensius commendatos ipsum in ampliandis et conseruandis iuribus suis sic tui fauoris presidio prosequaris, quod ipse tuo fultus auxilio in commisso sibi ecclesie Sodorensis prefate regimine se possit utilius exercere, tuque diuinam misericordiam et benedictionem dicte sedis exinde ualeas uberius promereri. Datum *ut supra.*

In e. m. Dilecto filio Nobili viro Villelmo de Monteacuto domino terre Mannie Sodorensis diocesis salutem etc. Ad cumulum *et cetera ut in superiori que dirigitur Archiepiscopo usque* oportuni fauoris presidio prosequaris *et cetera usque* dirigetur. Cum igitur ut idem electus in commissa sibi dicte Sodorensis ecclesie cura facilius præficere ualeat tuus fauor sibi esse noscatur plurimum oportunus, discretionem tuam rogamus et hortamur attente, quatinus eundem Electum et commissam sibi dictam ecclesiam habeas pro nostra et dicte sedis reuerentia propensius commendatos in ampliandis et conseruandis eiusdem ecclesie iuribus se possit utilius exercere, tuque proinde diuinam misericordiam et beniuolentiam ualeas uberius promereri. Datum *ut supra.*

In e. m. Dilecto filio Nobili viro Roberto Stiward dicto Senescallo Scocie domino Jnsule de Bote Sodorensis diocesis salutem etc. Ad cumulum *etc. ut in superiori que dirigitur Villelmo usque ad finem.*

In e. m. Dilecto filio Nobili viro Johanni Mac Dofnald domino de Jle Sodorensis diocesis. Ad cumulum etc.

(Clement. VI. commun. an. 7. l. 3. fol. 131. ep. 368. In arch. secr. Vat.)

No. 17. (April 27, 1349).

Clemens episcopus seruus seruorum dei. Venerabili fratri Arnoni Archiepiscopo Nidrocensi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Ad cumulum tue cedit salutis et fame si personas ecclesiasticas, presertim pontificali dignitate preditas, diuine propiciationis intuitu oportuni presidij et fauoris gratia prosequaris. Olim siquidem ecclesia Sodorensis per obitum bone memorie Thome episcopi Sodorensis, qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum, pastoris solacio destituta, dilecti filij Clerus ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis, ad quos Electio Episcopi Sodorensis, cum tempore imminebat facienda, de antiqua et approbata et hactenus pacifice obseruata consuetudine dicitur pertinere, die ad eligendum prefixa ut moris est conuenientes in vnum, spiritus sancti gratia inuocata, dilectum filium Wilhelmum Electum Sodorensem, tunc Abbatem monasterij de Russin ordinis Cisterciensis, Sodorensis diocesis, quasi per inspirationem diuinam in Episcopum Sodorensem vnanimiter et concorditer elegerunt, et electionem huiusmodi fecerunt populo solenniter publicari, idemque Wilhelmus Electus presentate sibi electioni huiusmodi ad instanciam predictorum Cleri, prius a dilecto filio ... Abbate de Furnesio dicti ordinis, Eboracensis diocesis, patre Abbate dicti et de Russi monasteriorum superiore suo super hoc petita et obtenta licentia, consensit, in hiis omnibus statutis a iure temporibus obseruatis; et deinde idem Wilhelmus Electus dubitans quod prouisio ipsius ecclesie esset dispositioni apostolice reseruata, propter hoc ad sedem eandem personaliter accessit, et huiusmodi electionis negotium proponi fecit in consistorio coram nobis, et ipsius electionis nobis presentato decreto a nobis suppliciter postulauit ut electionem huiusmodi confirmare de benignitate dignaremur. Nos igitur electionem ipsam, eiusdemque Wilhelmi Electi persone merita per venerabilem fratrem nostrum Petrum Episcopum Penestrinum et dilectos filios nostros Guillelmum tituli sanctorum Quatuor coronatorum, presbyterum, et Galhardum Sancte Lucie in Silice diaconum Cardinales examinari fecimus diligenter, et facta nobis ab eisdem Episcopo Penestrino ac Cardinalibus super hiis relatione plenaria et fideli, quia predictam electionem inuenimus de ipso uiro religionis honeste, uite laudabilis, litterarum scientia predito ac morum honestate decoro, in spiritualibus prouido et in temporalibus circunspecto, canonice celebratam, electionem ipsam non obstante si eiusdem ecclesie Sodorensis pro-

uisio per nos uel predecessores nostros Romanos Pontifices eidem sedi sit specialiter uel generaliter reseruata, de fratrum nostrorum consilio auctoritate apostolica confirmamus, eundemque Wilhelmum Electum ipsi Sodorensi ecclesie in Episcopum preficimus et pastorem, curam et administrationem ipsius ecclesie sibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo, firma spe fiduciaque conceptis quod ipsa ecclesia Sodorensis dextera domini sibi assistente propicia, per ipsius industrie et circunspectionis fructuosum studium regetur utiliter et prospere dirigetur. Cum igitur ut idem Wilhelmus in commissa sibi ecclesie Sodorensis predicte cura facilius proficere ualeat, tuus fauor sibi esse noscitur plurimum oportunus, fraternitatem tuam rogamus et hortamur attente, per apostolica tibi scripta mandantes, quatinus ipsum Electum et ecclesiam Sodorensem predictos iure metropolitico tibi subiectas habens pro nostra et ipsius sedis reuerentia propensius commendatos, ipsum in ampliandis et conseruandis iuribus suis sic tui fauoris presidio prosequaris, quod ipse tuo fultus auxilio in commisso sibi ecclesie Sodorensis prefate regimine se possit utilius exercere, tuque diuinam misericordiam et benedictionem dicte sedis exinde ualeas uberius promereri. Datum Auinione .v. kal. Maij pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

In eundem modum dil. filio Wilhelmo Electo Sodorensi — dilectis filiis Clero Ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis — dilectis filiis Populo Ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis — dilecto filio Nobili viro Willelmo de Monteacuto domino terre Mannie Sodorensis diocesis — dilecto filio nobili viro Roberto, Stuvard dicto, Senescallo Scocie, domino Insule de Bote, Sodorensis diocesis — dilecto filio nobili viro Johanni Moac Dofnald, domino de Ile, Sodorensis diocesis.

(Clementis VI. commun. in arch. secr. Vat. an. VII. lib. 3. fol. 131. ep. 268.)

No. 18. (May 6, 1349).

Clemens etc. Uenerabili fratri Willelmo episcopo Sodorensi salutem etc. Pridem Sodorensis ecclesia solacio destituta pastoris nos ad personam tuam claris virtutum titulis insignitam nostre mentis aciem dirigentes, te de fratrum nostrorum consilio eidem ecclesie in episcopum preficimus et pastorem, curam et administrationem ipsius tibi in spiritua-

libus et temporalibus plenarie committendo prout in nostris inde confectis litteris plenius continetur. Cum autem postmodum per venerabilem fratrem nostrum Bertrandum Episcopum Ostiensem te fecerimus munus consecrationis impendi, fraternitati tue per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus apostolice sedis beneplacitis te conformans apud predictam ecclesiam Sodorensem cum nostre benedictionis gratia te personaliter conferens sic te in administratione ipsius diligenter et sollicite gerere studeas, vt vtilis administratoris industrie non inmerito gaudeat se commissam ac laudabilis fame tue odor ex tuis probabilibus actibus latius diffundatur, et preter retributionis eterne premium nostre beniuolentie gratiam et fauorem exinde vberius consequaris. Datum Auinione .ij. non. Maij pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

(Clement. VI. commun. in arch. secr. Vatican. ann. 7. lib. 3. ep. 1106.)

No. **19**. (May 7, 1349.)

Clemens episc. s. s. d. Venerabili fratri Guillelmo Episcopo Sodarensi salutem etc. Cum sicut pro parte tua fuit expositum coram nobis tam pro tuis expensis necessarijs quam ecclesie Sodarensis negocijs apud sedem apostolicam et alibi expediendis vtiliter te subire oporteat magna onera expensarum, nobis humiliter supplicasti, ut usque ad summam mille ducentorum florenorum auri mutuum contrahendi sub modis et formis infrascriptis, sine quibus creditores te putas invenire non posse tibi, largire (*sic*) tibi licenciam dignaremur; Nos igitur de tua tam in hijs quam in alijs circa eadem tua et ipsius ecclesie vtiliter promouenda et expedienda negocia circumspeccione ac diligencia plenius in domino confidentes, nec volentes quod propter expensarum ipsarum defectu indigenciam patiaris, uel quod eadem negocia inexpedita remanere contingat, tuis supplicationibus inclinati fraternitati tue contrahendi mutuum propter hoc vsque ad predictam summam mille ducentorum florenorum auri nomine tuo et ipsius ecclesie Sodarensis, ac te et successores tuos episcopos Sodarenses et predictam ecclesiam ac tua et eorundem bona mobilia et immobilia, presencia et futura, usque ad summam predictam propterea dictis creditoribus, vsuris omnino cessantibus, obligandi, et renunciandi de duabus dietis edite (*sic*) in concilio generali fe-

cis recordacionis Bonifacii pape octaui predecessoris nostri, qua cauetur ne quis extra suam ciuitatem et diocesim nisi in certis exceptis casibus et in illis ultra vnam dietam a fine sue diocesis ad iudicium euocetur et quibuscunque alijs constitucionibus a predecessoribus nostris Romanis Pontificibus super hoc editis, et beneficio restitucionis in integrum ac omnibus litteris et indulgencijs apostolicis impetratis ac eciam impetrandis, omni iuris canonici et ciuilis auxilio ac conuencioni iudicum et locorum si eorundem creditorum nomine super hijs apostolicis litteris contigerit impetrari, nec non et omnibus alijs excepcionibus per quas contra creditores eosdem tu dictique successores possetis imposterum vos tueri, plenam auctoritate apostolica concedimus facultatem. Volumus insuper et concedimus iuxta quod postulasti a nobis, quod tu et successores predicti creditoribus ipsis huiusmodi peccuniam de bonis dicte ecclesie soluere ac dampna, expensas et interesse reficere teneamini, si in termino qui ad hoc de tuo et ipsorum creditorum consensu fuerit constitutus eadem pecunia non fuerit persoluta, quodque ipsis creditoribus pretextu alicuius constitutionis canonice uel ciuilis aut cuiuscunque priuilegij uel indulgencie sedis predicte, de quibus in nostris litteris plenam et expressam, ac de uerbo ad uerbum oporteat fieri mencionem, ac per que tu et successores prefati valeatis vlterius uos tueri, dictam pecuniam in iam dicte ecclesie vtilitatem conuersam fore probandi necessitas non incumbat, sed sola tui fatentis confessio in instrumentis conficiendis super mutuo huiusmodi quantitatis inserta, sufficiens plena et efficax probacio irrefragabiliter habeatur. Ceterum ne in hec vorago locum sibi uendicet vsurarum, nostre intencionis existit et volumus, quod tu et hijdem successores dictam ecclesiam Sodarensem tua seu sua uel ipsius bona per ipsas nostras litteras per cuiuspiam fraudis seu calliditatis astucia sub quouis pallio seu colore uerborum ad usuras aliquas obligare nullatenus valeatis, easdem litteras, concessiones, cauciones et recogniciones seu promissiones per eas seu earum auctoritate uel occasione factas quoad obligaciones vsurarum huiusmodi decernentes irritas et inanes et nullius penitus existere firmitatis, eis nicholominus quoad premissa omnia, que vsurarum prauitatem non sapiant, in suo robore duraturis, nec usurarum pretextu maliciose aliquatenus inpugnandis. Volumus insuper quod dicta ecclesia ac bona ipsius pretextu nostre concessionis huiusmodi vltra biennium ab obligacionis huiusmodi tempore

numerandum nullatenus remaneant obligata presentes litteras et earum effectum quoad ipsam ecclesiam ac bona eiusdem ex tunc omnino carere viribus decernentes. Datum Auinione nonis Maij, pontificatus nostri anno septimo. (Clement. VI. commun. an. 7. l. 5. p. 2. fol. 126. ep. 470. In arch. secr. Vat.)

No. 20. (June 14, 1349.)

Clemens etc. venerabili fratri Willelmo episcopo Sodorensi salutem etc. Prouenit ex tue deuotionis affectu quo nos et Romanam ecclesiam reuereris, ut petitionibus tuis quantum cum deo possumus fauorabiliter annuamus. Cum itaque sicut ex parte tua fuit propositum coram uobis frequenter contingat nonnullas religiosas personas ad mensam tuam tuumque hospitium declinare, et ex eis aliquos tecum etiam residere quibus secundum statuta et consuetudines suorum ordinum est esus carnis interdictus, nos tuis supplicationibus inclinati ut tu eisdem personis possis auctoritate apostolica uescendi carnibus in hospitio tuo illis diebus duntaxat quibus a sacris canonibus esus carnium communiter prohibitus non existit, licentiam concedere et cum eis dispensare super hijs cum hoc uideris expedire, super quo tuam conscientiam oneramus, predictis statutis seu consuetudinibus ac priuilegijs apostolicis contrarijs nequaquam obstantibus, dummodo ipsi iuramento uel uoto speciali ad abstinentiam esus huiusmodi minime sint astricte, fraternitati tue tenore presentium indulgemus. Nulli ergo etc. Datum Auinione .xviij. kal. Julij pontificatus nostri anno octauo. (Clement. VI. commun. in arch. secr. Vatic. ann. 8, lib. 4, part 2, fol. 228 vs. ep. 936.)

No. 21. (February 3, 1353).

Innocentius episcopus seruus seruorum dei uenerabili fratri . . Episcopo Ergadiensi, ac dilectis filijs . . Abbati de Sagadal in Kentire, ac . . Priori de Orwansay, Ergadiensis et Sodorensis diocesium, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Cupientibus vitam ducere regularem apostolicum debet adesse presidium, ut eorum pium propositum possint ad laudem diuini nominis adimplere. Cum itaque dilectus filius Gillegeha-

nan, natus quondam Johannis Scriptoris de Mule, Acolitus Sodorensis diocesis, cupiat, sicut accepimus, in Monasterio Sancte (sic) Columbe de Hy ordinis Sancti Benedicti dicte diocesis vna cum dilectis filijs . . Abbate et conuentu dicti monasterii sub regulari habitu virtutum domino famulari, Nos volentes eundem Gillegehanan, cum quo dudum, ut non obstante macula seu defectu, quam seu quem partitur in oculo dextro, posset ad subdiaconatus et diaconatus ordines promoueri et beneficium ecclesiasticum sine cura obtinere, fuit auctoritate apostolica dispensatum, in huiusmodi suo laudabili proposito confouere, discretioni vestre *per* apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus vos uel duo aut vnus vestrum per vos uel alium seu alios eundem Gillegehanan, si sit ydoneus et aliud canonicum non obsistat, in dicto monasterio, si in eo certus monachorum numerus non habetur, uel etiam si huiusmodi numerus ibidem forsan existat, et de ipso numero aliquis deest ad tempus exnunc, alioquin quam primum aliquem deesse continget, recipi faciatis auctoritate nostra in monachum et in fratrem, sibique iuxta ipsius monasterii consuetudinem regularem habitum exhiberi, ac de communibus ipsius monasterii prouentibus sicut vni ex aliis prefati monasterij monachis integre prouideri, ipsumque ibidem sincera in domino caritate tractari, non obstantibus quibuscunque statutis et consuetudinibus monasterii et ordinis predictorum contrarijs, iuramento, confirmatione apostolica uel quacunque firmitate alia roboratis, aut si pro aliis scripta forsan apostolica ibidem sint directa, seu si eisdem Abbati et Conuentui uel quibusuis aliis communiter uel diuisim a prefata sit sede indultum, quod ad receptionem uel prouisionem alicuius minime teneantur et ad id compelli, aut quod interdici, suspendi uel excommunicari non possint per literas apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de uerbo ad uerbo de indulto huiusmodi mentionem, et qualibet alia dicte sedis indulgentia, generali uel speciali, cuiuscunque tenoris existat, per quam presentibus non expressam uel totaliter non insertam effectus earum impediri valeat quomodolibet uel differri, et de qua cuiusque toto tenore habenda sit in nostris literis mentio specialis; contradictores per censuram ecclesiasticam appellatione postposita compescendo. Datum Auinione .iij. Non. Februar. pontificatus nostri anno primo.

(Innocent. VI. cod. chart. in arch. Vat. T. V. fol. 556.)

No. 22. (November 28, 1354.)

Universis presentes literas inspecturis Stephanus miseratione diuina archiepiscopus Tholosanus domini nostri pape Camerarius salutem in domino. Ad vniuersitatis uestre notitiam deducimus tenore presentium, quod reuerendus in Christo. pater dominus Willelmus episcopus Sodorensis in prouincia Nidrosiensi pro parte partis sui communis seruitij, in quo est Camere domini nostri summi pontificis obligatus, ducentos et .xv. florenos auri prefate camere, nec non pro parte partis .iiij^{or} seruitiorum familiarium et officialium dicti domini nostri Pape quadraginta octo florenos auri et .xvi. denarios monete Auinionensis currentis clericis camere supradicte pro dictis familiaribus et officialibus recipientibus per manus fratris Thome de Cakan et Alexandri de Carlis familiaris sui die date presentium solui fecit. de quibus sic solutis ipsum dominum Episcopum, Sodorensem ecclesiam et successores suos ac eorum bona absoluimus tenore presentium et quitamus. Verum intellecta mole grauaminum pro parte ipsius domini Episcopi coram nobis exposita, que ipsum ad soluendum suum complementum communis seruitij et seruitiorum, quod sub certis penis et sententiis ac termino nondum elapso soluere tenebatur, reddebant et adhuc reddunt uerisimiliter impotentem, auctoritate nobis in hac parte commissa vsque ad festum Sancti Michaelis proxime venturum terminum sibi duximus prorogandum, ita tamen quod si in dicto termino sibi prorogato non satisfecerit de premissis, penis et sententijs quibus tenebatur antea sit astrictus. Insuper ipsum dominum Episcopum a suspensionis, excommunicationis et interdicti sententijs, ac reatu periurij et aliis penis, quod et quas incurrit propter solutionem premissorum non factam in termino sibi prefixo, auctoritate qua fungimur in hac parte duximus absoluendum, secum super irregularitate si quam contraxerit interea sic ligatus se immiscendo diuinis uel alias, non tamen in contemptum clauium, eadem auctoritate misericorditer dispensantes. In quorum testimonium presentes literas fieri fecimus et sigilli Camerariatus nostri appensione muniri. Datum Auinione die xxviij mensis Novembris anno domini Millesimo ccc^{mo} liiij^{o}. Indictione .vij. pontificatus sanctissimi patris et domini nostri domini Innocentii diuina prouidentia pape .vj.^{ti} anno secundo.

(Innoc. VI. Liber quitanciarum arch. Vat. fol. xlv.)

No. 23. (May 12, 1357).

Uniuersis presentes etc. Stephanus etc. salutem in domino. Ad vniuersitatis uestre notitiam deducimus, quod rev. in Christo pater dominus Guillelmus episcopus Sodorensis in prouincia Nidrociensi pro complemento sui communis seruitij in quo erat Camere domini nostri summi Pontificis obligatus, quadraginta quinque florenos auri prefate Camere, nec non et pro complemento quatuor seruitiorum familiarium et officialium dicti domini nostri Pape .xvj. florenos auri, duos solidos, .viij denarios monete Auinionensis currentis clericis camere supradicte pro dictis familiaribus et officialibus recipientibus per manus Lambertesqui de societate Albertorum tempore debito solui fecit, de quibus sic solutis ipsum dom. Episcopum, Sodorensem ecclesiam et successores suos ac eorum bona absoluimus tenore presentium et quitamus. In quorum testimonium presentes literas fieri fecimus et sigilli Camerariatus nostri appensione muniri. Datum Auinione, die .xij. mensis Maii anno domino millesimo ccc^{mo} lvij. indict .x. et pontif. domini nostri pape Innocentii .vj. anno quinto. (Innoc. VI. Liber quitanciarum. arch. Vat. fol. cxvij.)

No. 24. (March 17, 1363.)

Urbanus episc. s. s. dei uenerabili fratri Willelmo episcopo Sodorensi salutem etc. Intra solicitudines uarias, quibus assidue premimur illud angit precipue mentem nostram ut uiduatis ecclesijs et monasterijs prouisio auctore domino proueniat fructuosa. Dudum siquidem felicis recordacionis Clemens papa sextus predecessor noster prouisiones certarum ecclesiarum cathedralium et monasteriorum omnium tunc apud sedem apostolicam quocunque modo uacancium et inantea uacaturorum ordinacioni et disposicioni sue reseruauit, decernendo extunc irritum et inane si secus super hijs per quoscunque quauis auctoritate scienter uel ignoranter contingeret attemptari. Postmodum uero, ecclesia tua Sodorensi per obitum bone memorie Thome Episcopi Sodorensis, qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum, pastoris solacio destituta, dilecti filij Clerus ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis, ad quos electio Episcopi Sodorensis de antiqua et approbata et hactenus pacifice obseruata consuetudine dicitur pertinere, te tunc Abbatem monasterij de Russyn, ordinis

Cisterciensis, tue diocesis, in Sodorensem Episcopum elegerunt, idemque predecessor electionem huiusmodi, non obstante si eiusdem ecclesie prouisio per eum uel predecessores suos Romanos pontifices esset disposicioni dicte sedis specialiter uel generaliter reseruata, de fratrum suorum sancte Romane ecclesie Cardinalium, qui tunc erant, consilio auctoritate apostolica confirmauit, teque tunc apud sedem constitutum eandem ecclesie Sodorensi predicte prefecit in episcopum et pastorem, ac subsequenter dictus predecessor tibi apud sedem predictam munus fecit consecracionis impendi. Cum itaque dictum monasterium secundum premissa apud sedem uacauit et uacare noscatur eandem, de cuius prouisione dictus Clemens et pie memorie Jnnocencius papa sextus eiusdem Clementis successor predecessor noster, qui uno mense a die obitus Clementis non elapso prouisiones ecclesiarum Cathedralium et monasteriorum omnium tunc apud dictam sedem uacancium et uacaturorum imposterum ordinacioni et disposicioni sue cum similis interposicione decreti eciam reseruauit, minime ordinarunt, nos licet immeriti ad apicem summi apostolatus assumpti cum a nonnullis reuocaretur in dubium an post dicti Jnnocencij predecessoris obitum aliquis preter Romanum pontificem de abbatialibus et alijs dignitatibus et benificijs ecclesiasticis per eundem predecessorem dispositioni seu reseruatis et tempore sui obitus uacantibus disponere potuisset seu posset, ad huiusmodi ambiguitatis tollendum dubium declarauimus abbatiales et alias dignitates et beneficia huiusmodi per reseruacionem et decreta dicti Jnnocencij predecessoris affecta nullumque de illis preter Romanum pontificem en uice potuisse uel posse disponere quoquo modo, ac decreuimus irritum et inane quicquid in contrarium a quoquam quauis auctoritate scienter uel ignoranter attemptatum forsan erat tunc uel contingeret imposterum attemptari, ac deinde intellecto quod dilectus filius Rogerus de Bolton monachus monasterij de Furnesio dicti ordinis Eboracensis dictum ordinem ipsum expresse professus in sacerdocio et etate legitima constitutus, cui eciam de religionis zelo uite ac morum honestate alijsque multiplicium uirtutum meritis apud nos fidedigna testimonia perhibentur, utilis esset ad regimen dicti monasterii de Russyn, de quo nullus preter Romanum pontificem hac uice se intromittere potuit neque potest, reseruacione declaracione et decretis obsistentibus supradictis ac cupientes eidem monasterio ad huc ut prefertur uacanti licet in eo sicut accepimus dilectus filius Willel-

mus de Cokerham qui se gerit pro monacho monasterij de Furnesio predicto se intruserit illudque detineat indebite occupatum ne ulterioris uacacionis incommoda patiatur celeriter et salubriter prouidere, fraternitati tue de qua in hijs et alijs fiduciam gerimus in domino specialem per apost. scripta committimus et mandamus, quatinus si uocatis dicto Willelmo et alijs qui fuerint euocandi tibi constiterit eundem Willelmum uel alium in monasterio de Russyn canonicum titulum non habere de persona dicti Rogeri hac uice eidem monasterio sic uacanti auctoritate nostra prouideas ipsumque illi preficias in Abbatem, curam et administracionem eiusdem monasterii sibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo faciens ei amoto exinde dicto Willelmo et quolibet alio detentore a suis subditis obedienciam et reuerenciam debitam exhiberi, sibique nichilominus impendas uel per alium antistitem graciam et communionem dicte sedis habentem facias munus benedictionis impendi, Contradictores per censuram ecclesiasticam appellacione postposita compescendo. Volumus autem quod tu uel idem Antistes qui prefatum munus impendet postquam illud sibi impenditur ab eodem Rogero nostro et ecclesie Romane nomine fidelitatis debite solitum recipias uel recipiat iuramentum iuxta formam quam sub bulla nostra mittimus interclusam ac formam iuramenti quod dictus Rogerus prestabit nobis de uerbo ad uerbum per eius patentes literas suo sigillo signatas per proprium nuncium quantocius destinare procures seu procuret. Datum Auinione .xvj. kal. Aprilis pont. nostri anno primo.

(Urban V. Cod. Chart. in arch. Vat. T. VI. f. 445.)

No. 25. (January 10, 1364.)

Urbanus episcopus s. s. d. Uenerabili fratri Willelmo Episcopo Sodorensi salutem etc. Ex suscepto seruitutis officio uigilijs assiduis angimur et meditationis assiduitate pulsamur ut vacantibus ecclesijs et monasteriis vniuersis de celeris et salubris prouisionis remedio succuramus. Dudum siquidem in monasterio de Russyn Cisterciensis ordinis tue Sodorensis diocesis tunc apud sedem apostolicam vacante licet ut asserebatur quondam Willelmus de Cokerham qui se gerebat pro mo-

nacho [monasterii de Furnesio, dicti ordinis, Eboracensis diocesis [1], se in eo intrusisset illudque detineret indebite occupatum. Nos intellecto quod dilectus filius Rogerus de Boltoun monachus dicti monasterij de Furnesio ordinem ipsum expresse professus et in sacerdocio constitutus vtilis esset ad regimen monasterij supradicti tibi per alias literas dedimus in mandatis, ut si, uocatis dicto Willelmo et alijs qui forent euocandi, tibi constaret eundem Willelmum uel alium in dicto monasterio canonicum titulum non habere, de persona dicti Rogeri ea uice dicto monasterio auctoritate apostolica prouideres, ipsumque illi preficeres in abbatem prout in dictis literis plenius continetur. Cum autem postmodum, sicut pro parte dicti Rogeri fuit propositum in consistorio coram nobis, dictus Willelmus prefatis literis tibi minime presentatis de Romana curia, ad quam pro quibusdam suis negocijs promouendis accesserat, recedendo in loco de Montili (*sic*) Ademarij Valentine diocesis a ciuitate Auinionensi, ubi tunc cum dicta Curia residebamus sicut ad huc residemus ultra duas dietas legales non remoto, viam fuerit vniuerse carnis ingressus, nos, qui diu ante ipsius Willelmi obitum prouisiones omnium monasteriorum per obitum quorumcunque pro quibuscunque negotijs ad dictam curiam venientium seu recedentium ab eadem, si in locis ultra duas dietas a prefata Curia non remotis iam forsan obierant uel eos inantea contingeret de medio summoueri, ordinationi et dispositioni nostre duximus reseruandas, decernendo extunc irritum et inane si secus super hijs per quoscunque quauis auctoritate scienter uel ignoranter contingerat attemptari cupientes eidem monasterio, ne prolixioris vacationis subiaceat detrimentis celeriter et salubriter prouidere, fraternitati tue, de qua in hijs et alijs fiduciam gerimus in domino specialem, per apostolica scripta committimus et mandamus, quatinus eciam si prefatum monasterium per obitum dicti Willelmi uacare repereris de persona dicti Rogeri eidem monasterio auctoritate nostra prouideas, ipsumque illi preficias in abbatem, curam et administrationem ipsius monasterii de Russyn sibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo, ac faciendo sibi a suis subditis obedientiam et reuerenciam debitam et deuotam exhiberi, ac nichilominus impendas uel per alium antistitem gratiam et communionem dicte sedis habentem impendi facias munus benedictionis; Contradictores per

[1] [Originaliter scriptum „monacho dicti monasterii", sed postea in margine correctum.

censuram apostolicam appellatione postposita compescendo. Volumus aut quod tu uel idem antistes qui dicto Rogero prefatum munus [impendes uel] impendet postquam illud sibi impenderis [uel impenderit] ab eodem Rogero nostro et ecclesie Romane nomine de fidelitatis debite solitum recipias uel recipiat iuramentum iuxta formam quam sub bulla nostra mittimus interclusam ac formam iuramenti quod dictus Rogerus prestabit nobis de uerbo ad uerbum per patentes literas suo sigillo signatas per proprium nuncium procures seu procuret quamtocius destinare. Datum Auinione .iiij. Jdus Januar. pontif. nostri anno secundo.

(Urban. V. cod. chart. in arch. Vat. T. VII. fol. 113.)

No. 26. (January 23, 1367).

Urbanus episcopus s. s. dei dilecto filio Johanni Donnegan Archidiacono Dunensi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Probitatis et virtutum merita super quibus apud nos fidedignorum commendaris testimonio, nos inducunt, ut tibi reddamur ad gratiam liberales. Cum itaque Archidiaconatus ecclesie Dunensis quem venerabilis frater Willelmus episcopus Conuerensis tempore promotionis per nos facte de ipso ad Conuerensem ecclesiam tunc vacantem obtinebat, per huiusmodi promocionem et munus consecrationis de mandato nostro apud sedem apostolicam impensum eidem apud sedem eandem vacauerit et uacare noscatur ad presens, nullusque preter nos hac vice de illo disponere potuerit neque possit, pro eo quod nos diu ante vacationem huiusmodi omnes dignitates personatus et officia ceteraque beneficia ecclesiastica cum cura et sine cura tunc ap. dictam sedem vacantia et imposterum vacatura collationi et dispositioni nostre duximus reseruanda, decernentes extunc irritum et inane si secus super hijs a quoquam quauis auctoritate scienter uel ignoranter contingeret attemptari, nos volentes tibi, qui ut asseris in presbiteratus ordine constitutus et in jure canonico peritus existis, premissorum meritorum intuitu gratiam facere specialem, dictum Archidiaconatum, qui dignitas curata existit, consueta alijs quam canonicis ipsius ecclesie Dunensis assignari, sic vacantem, cuius fructus et prouentus quadraginta markarum Sterlingorum valorem annuum ut asseris non excedunt, cum omnibus juribus et pertinentijs suis apostolica tibi auc-

toritate conferimus et de illo etiam prouidemus, decernentes prout est irritum et inane si secus super hiis etc. Non obstantibus quibuscunque statutis et consuetudinibus ipsius ecclesie Dunensis contrarijs, etc. etc. Seu si venerabili fratri nostro episcopo et dilectis filijs capitulo Dunensibus uel quibusuis aliis communiter uel diuisim a prefata sit sede indultum quod ad receptionem uel prouisionem alicuius minime teneantur et ad id compelli non possent etc. etc. — Seu si presens non fueris ad prestandum de obseruandis statutis et consuetudinibus ipsius Dunensis ecclesie solitum juramentum, dummodo in absentia tua per procuratorem ydoneum, et cum ad ecclesiam ipsam accesseris corporaliter illud prestes, aut quod parrochialem ecclesiam de Camelino Dunensis diocesis nosceris obtinere; volumus autem quod quamprimum vigore presentium dictum archidiaconatum fueris pacifice assecutus, prefatam parroch. ecclesiam, quam extunc vacare decernimus omnino, prout etiam ad id te sponte obtulisti, dimittere tenearis. Nulli ergo etc. — Datum apud Montempessulanum Magalonensis diocesis, x. kal. Febr. pontificatus nostri anno quinto.

In eodem modo Venerabili fratri . . Episcopo Lismorensi et dilectis filijs Abbati monasterij de Jnys, Dunensis diocesis, ac decano ecclesie sancti Agricoli Auinionensis, salutem etc. Probitatis etc. *usque* teneretur. Quocirca mandamus, quatinus uos uel duo aut vnus vestrum per uos uel alium seu alios eundem Johannem uel procuratorem suum eius nomine in corporalem possessionem Archidiaconatus et iurium et pertinentiarum predictorum inducatis auctoritate nostra et defendatis inductum, amoto exinde quolibet detentore, etc. etc. Datum ut supra.

(Urban. V. cod. chart. T. xv. fol. 110. in Arch. secr. Vat.)

No. 27. (May 13, 1367.)

Urbanus episcopus seruus seruorum dei uenerabili fratri (Willelmo) Episcopo Sodorensi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Oblate nobis nuper pro parte nobilis viri Lacolanni Johannis dicti Macguilleon domicelli et nobilis mulieris Marie de Insulis nate dilecti filij nobilis viri Johannis domini Insularum tue diocesis peticionis series continebat, quod olim idem Lacolannus non ignorans se et dictam Mariam quarto con-

sanguinitatis gradu fore coniunctos et prefata Maria huiusmodi consanguinitatis gradum penitus ignorans, cupientes diuturnis guerris et scandalis que inter vtriusque parentes ipsorum et amicos uigebant, quarum occasione nonnulla homicidia, incendia, spolia et rapine in locis sacris et non sacris fuerant multipliciter subsecuta, obuiare parentum et maioris partis amicorum suorum ad id interueniente tractatu, pariter et assensu, matrimonium per uerba legitime dé presenti nullis tamen bannis edictis timore quorumdam emulorum suorum, guerram huiusmodi magis quam pacem desiderantium, clandestine inuicem contraxerunt, propter quod Lacolannus a Canone tam ipse quam et Maria predicta per prouinciales seu synodales constituciones promulgatas excommunicacionis sentencias incurrisse noscuntur, iidemque Lacolannus et Maria matrimonium huiusmodi postmodum carnali copula consumarunt et prolem exinde procrearunt, quodque ex eorum separacione, si fieret, scandala peiora prioribus possent verisimiliter exoriri. Quare pro parte Lacolanni et Marie predictorum nobis extitit humiliter supplicatum, ut prouidere eis de absolucionis beneficio ab huiusmodi excommunicacionis sentencijs, quas propter premissa incurrerunt, ut prefertur, et dispensacionis gracia de benignitate apostolica dignaremur. Nos igitur, qui salutem querimus singulorum, et libenter Christi fidelibus quietis et pacis commoda procuramus, uolentes Lacolannj et Marie predictorum super premissis animarum prouidere saluti, ac cupientes huiusmodi scandalis quantum cum deo possumus salubriter obuiare , fraternitati tue, de qua in hijs et alijs specialem in domino fiduciam obtinemus, per apostolica scripta committimus et mandamus, quatinus, si est ita et tibi expediens uideatur, quod dicta dispensacio concedatur, super quo tuam conscienciam oneramus, Lacolannum et Mariam prefatos ab huiusmodi excommunicacionis sentencijs quas, ut prefertur, incurrerunt, auctoritate nostra iuxta formam ecclesie absoluas iniunctis eis inter alia sub uirtute iuramenti prestandi, quod de cetero talia non committant nec facientibus prebeant auxilium, consilium uel fauorem, et eciam penitencia salutari, ac alijs que de iure fuerint iniungenda, et demum cum iisdem Lacolanno et Maria, ut impedimento quod ex consanguinitate huiusmodi prouenit non obstante, dummodo dicta Maria propter hoc rapta non fuerit, et ad id parentum predictorum et maioris partis consanguineorum Lacolanni et Marie predictorum citra tercium gradum accedat assensus, in sic contracto matrimonio licite rema-

nere ualeant, auctoritate predicta dispenses, prolem susceptam huiusmodi et ex dicto matrimonio suscipiendam legitimam decernendo. Volumus autem quod idem Lacolannus, si eidem Marie superuixerit, perpetuo remaneat innuptus. Datum Massilie .iij. Idus Maij pontificatus nostri anno quinto. (Urban. V. cod. chart. T. XIII. f. 445. Arch Vat.)

No. 28. (December 7, 1367.)

Urbanus etc. uenerabili fratri episcopo Sodorensi salutem etc. Intenta salutis operibus apostolice sedis benignitas circunspecta [votis] [1] illorum qui diuina preuenti gracia augmentum cultus diuini nominis intentis desiderijs affectantes ad id eorum opem et operam impendere cupiunt, libenter apostolicum impertitur assensum eaque fauoribus prosequitur graciosis. Sane peticio pro parte dilectorum filiorum prioris prouincialis et fratrum ordinis minorum prouincie Ybernie sed in morem dicti ordinis ac dilecti filij nobilis viri Guillelmi de Monte acuto comitis Saresbiriensis peticio continebat, quod in diocesi Sodorensi nullus locus ad [usum] ordinis minorum fore dinoscitur, quodque idem Comes de salute propria cogitans, ac cupiens terrena in celestia et transitoria in eterna felici commercio commutare ad omnipotentem dei laudem et gloriam, ac pro sue et aliorum Christi fidelium animarum salute, vnum locum ad opus et vsum dictorum fratrum in villa sancte (*sic*) Columbe in Jnsula Mannie dicte diocesis cuius idem Comes dominus existit, consistente assignare proponit. Quare pro parte dictorum prioris et fratrum ac comitis nobis fuit humiliter supplicatum, ut ipsis priore et fratribus recipiendi locum huiusmodi et in eo construendi seu edificandi ecclesiam seu oratorium cum campanili campana cimiterio domibus et alijs necessarijs officinis licenciam concedere de benignitate apostolica dignaremur. Nos itaque huiusmodi supplicationibus inclinati fraternitati tue per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus si est ita, eisdem priori et fratribus recipiendi locum huiusmodi si sit congruus et honestus et ibidem edificandi seu construendi ecclesiam seu oratorium cum campanili campana cimiterio domibus et alijs necessarijs officinis predictis, dum modo duodecim fratres dicti ordinis in loco ipso degentes pro tempore

[1] Errore vel incuria omissum in Reg.

ibidem congrue et honeste sustentari valeant, jure tamen parrochialis ecclesie et cuiuslibet alterius in omnibus semper saluo, constitutione felicis recordationis Bonifacij pape .viij. predecessoris nostri, prohibente ne religiosi ordinis mendicancium loca de nouo recipiant absque licencia sedis apostolice speciali faciente plenam et expressam de prohibitione huiusmodi mentionem nequaquam obstante, auctoritate apostolica licenciam largimur. Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum .vj. Idus Decembris pontificatus nostri anno sexto.

(Urban. V. commun. in. arch. secr. Vat. ann. 6. fol. 156. ep. 88.)

No. 29. (April 17, 1368.)

Urbanus episcopus seruus seruorum dei. Dilecto filio Johanni Donnegan Archidiacono Dunensi salutem etc. Laudabilia probitatis et virtutum merita, super quibus apud nos fidedignorum commendaris testimonio, nos inducunt ut te fauore apostolico prosequamur. Dudum siquidem de Archidiaconatu ecclesie Dunensis, quem venerabilis frater noster Willermus episcopus Conuerensis tempore promocionis per nos de ipso facte ad Conuerensem ecclesiam tunc vacantem obtinebat, per huiusmodi promocionem et munus consecracionis de mandato nostro, ut asserebatur, apud sedem apostolicam impensum eidem, apud sedem eandem, ut asserebatur, vacante, et per nos antea disposicioni apostolice reseruato tibi duximus per nostras litteras prouidendum, prout in eisdem litteris plenius continetur, tuque deinde, sicut asseris, vigore litterarum earundem ipsius Archidiaconatus extitisti possessionem assecutus; Cum autem, sicut exhibita nobis postmodum pro parte tua peticio continebat, ad tuam de nouo peruenit noticiam, quod eidem episcopo non apud sedem prefatam sed extra Romanam curiam extitit munus consecracionis huiusmodi de speciali mandato nostro impensum, nos, qui eciam diu ante vacacionem huiusmodi omnes dignitates, personatus et officia, ceteraque beneficia ecclesiastica, que promouendi per nos ad quarumlibet ecclesiarum cathedralium regimina tempore promocionum huiusmodi obtinebant et imposterum obtinerent, cum ea vacarent, cum similis interposicione decreti duximus reseruanda, volentes te premissorum meritorum tuorum intuitu fauore prosequi gracioso, tuis in hac parte supplicationibus incli-

nati volumus et apostolica tibi auctoritate concedimus, quod littere prefate ac processus habiti per eosdem et quecunque inde secuta valeant et plenam roboris firmitatem obtineant, non obstantibus premissis et omnibus alijs que in dictis prioribus/litteris voluimus non obstare. Nulli ergo etc. Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum, xv. kal. Maij pontificatus nostri anno sexto.

(Urban. V. cod. chart. T. XIX. fol. 345. arch. secr. Vatic.)

No. 30. (December 22, 1368.)

Urbanus episcopus s. s. d. dil. fil. Archidiacono Mannie in ecclesia Sodorensi salutem etc. exhibita nobis pro parte dilecti filij Johannis Hugonis perpetui vicarij parrochialis ecclesie sancti Lupi in Mania Sodorensis diocesis peticio continebat, quod fructus dicte ecclesie, quam dilecti filij Abbas et conuentus monasterij de Russyn Cisterciensis ordinis dicte diocesis in proprios vsus detinent, .xl. librarum sterlingorum et ultra secundum communem extimationem valent et valere consueuerunt annuatim, et quod porcio pro perpetuo vicario dicte ecclesie assignata sex marchas dicte monete annuatim non excedit, quodque dudum, dum dicta porcio pro perpetuo vicario dicte ecclesie, qui tunc erat, pro sex marchis dicte monete melius viuere poterat, quam dictus Johannes vicarius nunc possit pro uiginti. Quare pro parte dicti vicarij nobis fuit humiliter supplicatum, ut cum cura dicte ecclesie propter nouos habitatores infra eius parrochiam venientes quam plurimum creuerit, dictusque vicarius ex porcione predicta non possit congrue sustentari et ei incumbencia onera supportare, et propter quod eidem ecclesie non possit sicut deberet in diuinis seruire, ac parrochialis ipsius ecclesie sacramenta ecclesiastica ministrare, ac Abbas et conuentus predicti, licet super hoc per dictum vicarium fuerint requisiti, porcionem huiusmodi augmentare recusent, uenerabilisque frater noster episcopus Sodorensis, ad quem vicarius predictus super hijs recursum habuit, de hoc se intromittere non curauerit, prouidencie tue per apost. scripta mandamus, quatinus vocatis qui fuerint euocandi, et auditis hinc inde propositis, quod canonicum fuerit, appellacione remota decernas, faciens quod decreueris per censuram ecclesiasticam firmiter obseruari, testes autem qui fuerint nominati,

si se gracia, odio uel timore subtraxerint, censura simili, appellacione cessante, compellas ueritati testimonium perhibere, non obstante si eidem ordini a dicta sit sede indultum, quod persone ipsius ordinis ad iudicium trahi aut suspendi uel excommunicari, seu ipse aut dicti ordinis loca interdici non possint per litteras apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de uerbo ad uerbum de indulto huiusmodi mencionem, et qualibet alia dicte sedis indulgencia generali uel speciali, cuiuscunque tenoris existat, per quam presentibus non expressam uel totaliter non insertam tue jurisdiccionis in hac parte explicacio valeat quomodolibet impediri que quoad hoc nolumus aliquatenus suffragari. Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum .xi. kal. Januarij pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

(Urban. V. cod. chart. T. XX. fol. 432. arch. secr. Vatic.)

No. 31. (March 13, 1369).

Urbanus etc. dilecto filio Johanni Doncan Archidiacono Dunensi, apostolice sedis nuncio capellano nostro salutem etc. Benigno sunt tibi illa concedenda fauore per que sicut pie desideras conscientie pacem et salutem anime deo propitio consequi merearis. Hinc est quod nos tuis deuotis supplicationibus inclinati tibi apostolica auctoritate indulgemus ut quamdiu nostris et ecclesie Romane seruicijs institeris aliquem ydoneum et discretum in tuum possis eligere confessorem qui quotiens tibi fuerit oportunum confessionibus tuis diligenter auditis pro commissis debitam tibi absolucionem impendat et iniungat penitenciam salutarem, nisi forsan talia fuerint propter que sedes apostolica sit merito consulenda. Nulli ergo etc. Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum .iij. Idus Martij, pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

(Urban. V. commun. in arch. secr. Vat. an. 7. fol. 58. ep. 279.)

No. 32. (December 1, 1371.)

Gregorius etc. Dilecto filio Johanni Doncan Archidiacono Dunensi, apostolice sedis nuncio, salutem etc. Discretioni tue tenore presentium mandamus quatinus de pecunijs ex prouentibus et iuribus quibuscunque

ad cameram apostolicam pertinentibus in partibus in quibus es nuncius apostolicus deputatus per te et succollectores a te seu a predecessoribus tuis deputatos recollectis et predicte camere seu alijs pro ea nondum assignatis dilectis filijs Raynerio Dominici, Petro Marci, Bartholo Johannis et Talento Andree de Florencia de societate Albertorum antiquorum et Angelo Johannis et Bernardo Nicolai factoribus et procuratoribus Albertorum antiquorum sex milia florenorum auri in ciuitate Londoniensi tradas realiter et assignes, etc. Datum Auinione kal. Decembr. pontificatus nostri anno primo.

(Gregor. XI. Secr. de Curia, in arch. secr. Vat. ann. I. fol. 245.)

No. 33. (September 10, 1372.)

Gregorius episcopus s. s. dei Venerabili fratri Episcopo Ergadiensi ac dilectis filiis decano sancti Petri Auinionensis ac Archidiacono Ergadiensis ecclesiarum salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Vite ac morum honestas aliaque probitatis merita super quibus apud nos dilectus filius Mactyr Johannis Judicis clerici Sodorensis diocesis fidedignorum commendatur testimonio nos inducunt ut sibi reddamur ad gratiam liberales. Cum itaque sicut accepimus parrochialis ecclesia Sancti Columbe de Hey dicte diocesis quam quondam Dominicus Kenniti vltimus ipsius ecclesie Rector dum viueret obtinebat per ipsius Dominici obitum qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum vacet ad presens et tanto tempore vacauerit quod eius collatio est iuxta statuta Lateranensis concilij ad sedem apostolicam legitime deuoluta, nos volentes dicto Mactyr premissorum etc. intuitu gratiam f. specialem, discr. v. per ap. scr. m. q. vos etc. si premissa repereritis ueritate fulciri, dictam parrochialem ecclesiam, cuius fructus redditus et prouentus decem marcharum sterlingorum secundum communem extimacionem valorem annuum, ut idem Mactyr asserit, non excedunt, dummodo tempore dat. presencium non sit in ea alicui specialiter ius quesitum, eciam si ecclesia ipsa sit disp. sedis apost. specialiter reseruata, eidem Mactyr cum omnibus iuribus etc. auctoritate nostra conferre et assignare curetis etc. contradictores auct. nostra appellacione postposita compescendo, non obstante etc. - seu si uen. fr. nostro Episcopo Sodorensi uel quibusuis aliis communiter uel

diuisim a dicta sit sede indultum quod ad recepcionem etc. minime teneantur etc. - Datum apud Villamnouam Auiniensis diocesis quarto Id. Sept. pontificatus nostri anno secundo.

(Gregor. XI. cod. chart. T. XII. fol. 87. arch. secr. Vat.)

No. 34. (November 6, 1374.)

Gregorius episcopus seruus seruorum dei Johanni Electo Sodorensi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Suscepti cura regiminis cor nostrum continua pulsat instantia ut solicitudinis debitum, ad quod vniuersis orbis ecclesijs nos apostolice seruitutis necessitas obligat, earum singulis prout ex alto conceditur exoluamus in eo potissime, ut illarum Regimina, que propriis sunt destitute pastoribus, personis talibus committantur, per quarum solertiam circumspectam ecclesie ipse in spiritualibus et temporalibus valeant adaugeri. Dudum siquidem bone memorie Willermo episcopo Sodorensi regimini Sodorensis ecclesie presidente nos cupientes eidem ecclesie, cum eam vacare contingeret, per operationis nostre ministerium utilem et ydoneam presidere personam, prouisionem eiusdem ecclesie ordinationi et dispositioni nostre ea vice duximus specialiter reseruandam, decernendo extunc irritum et inane si secus super hoc a quoquam quauis auctoritate scienter uel ignoranter contingeret attemptari. Postmodum uero prefata ecclesia per obitum eiusdem Willermi episcopi, qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum, pastoris solatio destituta, nos vacatione huiusmodi fidedignis relatibus intellecta, ad prouisionem eiusdem ecclesie celerem et felicem, de qua nullus preter nos hac vice se intromittere potuit neque potest, reseruatione et decreto obsistentibus supradictis, ne ipsa ecclesia prolixe vacationis exponeretur incommodis, paternis et solicitis studijs intendentes, post deliberationem, quam de preficiendo eidem ecclesie personam utilem et etiam fructuosam cum fratribus nostris habuimus diligentem, demum ad te Archidiaconum Dunensem, in sacerdotio constitutum, cui de litterarum scientia, vite munditia, honestate morum, spiritualium prouidentia et temporalium circumspectione aliisque uirtutum meritis apud nos laudabilia testimonia perhibentur, pro quo etiam dilecti filij clerus ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis per eorum patentes litteras nobis super hoc humi-

liter supplicarunt, direximus oculos nostre mentis, quibus omnibus debita meditatione pensatis, de persona tua, nobis et eisdem fratribus ob dictorum tuorum exigentiam meritorum accepta, ipsi Sodorensi ecclesie de predictorum fratrum consilio auctoritate apostolica prouidemus, teque illi preficimus in episcopum et pastorem, curam et administrationem ipsius ecclesie tibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo, in illo qui dat gratias et largitur premia confidentes, quod eadem ecclesia per tue circumspectionis industriam et prouidentiam circumspectam sub tuo felici regimine, dextera domini tibi assistente propitia, salubriter et prospere dirigetur, et grata in eisdem spiritualibus et temporalibus suscipiet incrementa. Jugum igitur domini tuis impositum humeris prompta deuotione suscipiens, curam et administrationem predictas sic exercere studeas solicite, fideliter et prudenter, quod ecclesia ipsa gubernatori prouido et fructuoso administratori gaudeat se commissam, tuque preter eterne retributionis premium beniuolentie nostre gratiam exinde uberius consequi merearis. Datum Auinione .viij. Jdus Novembris pontificatus nostri anno quarto.

In eodem modo Dilectis filijs Capitulo ecclesie Sodorensis salutem etc. curam etc. (*mutatis mutandis*, *vid. No. 16*).

In eodem modo Dilectis filijs Clero Ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis salutem etc. Suscepti cura etc. (*mutatis mutandis*).

In eodem modo. Dilectis filijs Populo Ciuitatis et diocesis Sodorensis salutem etc. Suscepti cura etc. (*mutatis mutandis*).

In eodem modo Dilectis filijs vniuersis vassallis ecclesie Sodorensis salutem etc. Suscepti cura etc. Quocirca uniuersitati uestre per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus eundem electum suscipientes deuote et debita honorificentia prosequentes, ei fidelitatem solitam necnon consueta seruitia et jura a vobis debita exhibere integre studeatis, alioquin sententiam siue penam, quam idem Electus rite tulerit seu statuerit in rebelles, ratam habebimus et faciemus auctore domino usque ad satisfactionem condignam inuiolabiliter obseruari. D. u. s.

In e. m. Carissimo in Chr. filio Roberto Regi Scotie illustri salutem etc. Gratie diuine premium et humane laudis preconium acquiritur, si per seculares principes prelatis, presertim ecclesiarum cathedralium regimini presidentibus, oportuni fauoris presidium et honor debitus impendatur. Dudum siquidem etc. *usque* incrementa. Cum itaque fili

carissime sit uirtutis opus dei ministros benigno fauore prosequi, ac eos uerbis et operibus pro regis eterni gloria uenerari, Serenitatem Regiam rogamus et hortamur attente, quatinus eundem electum et prefatam ecclesiam Sodorensem sue cure commissam habens pro nostra et apostolice sedis reuerentia propensius commendatos, ipsos benigne fauoris auxilio prosequaris, ita quod idem Electus tue celsitudinis fultus presidio in commissis sibi cure pastoralis officio possit deo propitio prosperari, ac tibi exinde a deo perennis vite premium et a nobis condigne proueniat actio gratiarum. D. u. s.

In e. m. Carissimo in Chr. filio Wilhelmo Regi Minauie illustri salutem etc. Gratia etc. (*ut supra*).

In e. m. Venerabili fratri Archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi salutem etc. Ad cumulum tue cedit salutis et fame, si personas ecclesiasticas, presertim pontificali dignitate preditas, diuine propitiationis intuitu oportuni fauoris gratia prosequaris. Dudum siquidem etc. *usque* incrementa. Cum igitur ut idem electus in commissa sibi dicte ecclesie cura facilius proficere valeat, tuus fauor sibi esse noscatur plurimum oportunus, fraternitatem tuam rogamus, monemus et hortamur attente, per apostolica tibi scripta mandantes, quatinus ipsum electum et ecclesiam sue cure commissam, suffraganeam tuam, habens pro nostra et apostolice sedis reuerentia penitus commendatos, in ampliandis et conseruandis ipsius ecclesie juribus sic eum tui fauoris presidio prosequaris, quod ipse per tue auxilium gratie in commisso sibi dicte ecclesie regimine se possit utilius exercere, tuque exinde diuinam misericordiam et nostram ac dicte sedis gratiam valeas uberius promereri. Dat. u. s.

(Gregor. XI. de curia, ann. IV. fol. 96. arch. secr. Vat.)

No. 35. (September 20, 1375.)

Gregorius episcopus s. s. dei Uenerabili fratri . . Episcopo Lismorensi salutem etc. Exhibita nobis pro parte dilecti filij Ayg' Mac Petri perpetui vicarij parrochialis ecclesie sancte Columbe de Kerepol Sodorensis diocesis peticio continebat quod olim dilecto filio Nigello Macfinilaich qui se gerit pro presbitero dicte diocesis falso suggerente nobis quod bone memorie Willelmus Episcopus Sodorensis eundem Ayg' suis

exigentibus demeritis perpetua vicaria dicte parrochialis ecclesie auctoritate ordinaria priuauerat et quod propterea dicta vicaria vacabat et tanto tempore vacauerat, quod eius collacio iuxta statuta Lateranensis concilij erat ad sedem apost. legitime deuoluta, licet idem Ayg' eam ad huc detineret indebite occupatam, Nos dil. filio archidiacono Mannie in eccles. Sodorensi et duobus alijs eius in hac parte collegis nostris dedimus litteris in mandatis quod ipsi uel duo aut vnus eorum per se uel alium seu alios, si, vocatis dicto Ayg' et alijs qui forent euocandi, reperirent ita esse, predictam vicariam, dummodo tempore date dictarum litterarum non esset in eadem vicaria alicui specialiter jus quesitum, prefato Nigello cum omnibus iuribus et pertinenciis suis auctoritate nostra conferre et assignare cur(ar)ent, contradictores etc.; prefatus quoque Archidiaconus ad instanciam dicti Nigelli solus in huiusmodi procedens negocio nulla super premissis suggestis cognicione prehabita, quanquam sibi de suggestis ipsis aliquatenus non constaret prout nec constare poterat, cum ea non essent notoria neque uera, dictoque Ayg' non vocato. ad hoc sed absente non per contumaciam, forma eciam dictarum litterarum non seruata, prefatam vicariam nec de iure nec de facto vacantem vtpote quam dictus Ayg' canonice fuerat assecutus et eam pacifice et canonice possidebat prout superius est expressum predicto Nigello contulit, eumque in ipsius vicarie corporal. possessionem mandauit et fecit induci, in contradictores quoslibet et rebelles diuersos suspensionis, excommunicacionis et interdicti sentencias promulgando; a quibus quidem collacione, induccione in possessionem, et processibus predictis pro parte prefati Ayg', quam primum ad eius noticiam peruenerunt sencientis ex eis indebite se grauari, fuit ad sedem ap. appellatum ac nobis deinde humiliter supplicatum ut prouidere sibi in premissis de benignitate ap^{ca} dignaremur. Nos itaque huiusmodi supplicacionibus inclinati fraternitati tue, cum dictus Ayg', sicut asserit, potenciam dicti Nigelli merito perhorrescens infra ciuitatem et diocesim Sodorensem nequeat conuenire secure, per ap. scr. mand. quat. vocatis etc., quod canonicum fuerit, appellacione remota decernas, faciens quod decreueris per censuram ecclesiasticam firmiter obseruari; Testes autem etc. si se gracia, odio uel amore etc. — Non obstante etc. — Datum apud Pontemsorgie Auinionensis diocesis .xij. kal. Octobr. pontif. nostri anno quinto.

(Gregor. XI. cod. chart. T. XXIV. f. 33. arch. secr. Vatic.)

No. 36. (May 26, 1377).

Gregorius etc. dilecto filio Malcolmo Ysaye presbitero Sodorensi salutem etc. Vite ac morum honestas aliaque probitatis et virtutum merita super quibus apud nos fidedignorum commendaris testimonio nos inducunt ut te fauore apostolico presequamur. Exhibita siquidem nobis nuper pro parte tua petitio continebat quod olim parrochiali ecclesia sancti Moliwe Sodorensis diocesis per obitum quondam Dampnaldi (*sic*) Nigelli ipsius ecclesie rectoris qui extra Romanam curiam diem clausit extremum vacante, dilectus filius nobilis uir Johannes dominus loci de Yle dicte diocesis uerus patronus eiusdem parrochialis ecclesie in pacifica possessione uel quasi juris presentandi Rectorem ad eandem ecclesiam existens, te ad eandem parrochialem ecclesiam uenerabili fratri nostro Willelmo Episcopo Sodorensi infra tempus legitimum presentauit, idemque episcopus te uigore presentationis huiusmodi in Rectorem ecclesie instituit antedicte canonice, nisi apostolice reseruationes obstarent, aut dicta ecclesia ex eo, quod quondam Martinus Martini eiusdem ecclesie Rector se non fecerat infra tempus debitum cessante impedimento legitimo nullaque super hoc canonica dispensatione obtenta ad sacerdotium promoueri, vacauisset, ac propterea tanto tempore vacauisset quod eius collatio esset ad sedem apostolicam iuxta statuta Lateranensis consilij (*sic*) legitime deuoluta, tuque vigore presentationis et institutionis huiusmodi dictam parrochialem ecclesiam assecutus fuisti illamque extunc tenuisti et possedisti prout tenes et possides pacifice et quiete. Cum autem sicut eadem petitio subiungebat tu dubites dictam ecclesiam tempore presentationis seu institutionis huiusmodi fore dispositioni apostolice specialiter reseruatam aut ex eo vacauisse quod predictus Martinus se non fecerat ad sacerdotium ut premittitur promoueri, et propterea eiusdem ecclesie collationem ad sedem predictam iuxta statuta prefata fore deuolutam, tuque propterea posse super ea imposterum molestari, Nos uolentes te in presbiteratus ordine constitutum premissorum meritorum tuorum intuitu prosequi gratiose, tuis in hac parte supplicationibus inclinati volumus et tibi apostolica auctoritate concedimus quod presentatio et institutio predicte et quecumque inde secuta perinde a datis presentium, dummodo dictus Dampnaldus dum viueret familiaris noster non fuerit, valeant et plenam obtineant roboris firmitatem, ac si de dicta parrochiali ecclesia nulla per sedem eandem specialis reseruatio facta

foret, aut ex eo ecclesia ipsa, quod dictus Martinus se non fecit ut prefertur ad sacerdotium promoueri, non vacauisset, et propterea eiusdem parrochialis ecclesie collatio iuxta statuta prefata ad sedem predictam ut prefertur deuoluta minime extitisset. Nulli ergo etc. Datum Auinione vij. kal. Junij pontificatus nostri anno .vj^{to}.

(Gregor. XI. de indult. et privil. in arch. secr. Vatic. an. 6. fol. 89. ep. 463.)

No. 37. (May 9, 1380.)

Urbanus etc. dilectis filiis Johanni de Karlellis Cancellario Dublinensi et Willelmo Pyroim Rectori parrochialis in Dounbing ecclesiarum Ardmachane diocesis in partibus Ibernie apostolice sedis nuncijs salutem et cetera. Ad audienciam nostram fidedigna relatione peruenit quod uenerabilis fratres nostri Wilhelmus Yniglacensis et Johannes Sodorensis Episcopi in partibus Jbernie nuncij apostolici et collectores fructuum prouentuum et obuencionum ad Cameram apostolicam spectancium deputati multas pecunias racione huiusmodi officij collectorie receperunt de quibus gentibus Camere nostre uel aliis earum nomine nullam reddiderunt racionem seu computum aliquale jpsasque pecunias presumpcione temeraria occupant et detinent occupatas in apostolice sedis contemptum et suarum periculum animarum. Quare discrecioni uestre presencium tenore committimus et mandamus quatinus uos aut vnus vestrum per uos uel alium seu alios dictos episcopos peremtorie citari curetis ut cum eorum computis et racionibus compareant personaliter coram nobis uel Camerario nostro ad reddendum de gestis per eos racionem, et aliqua reddendum, die seu termino quem eisdem duxeritis prefigendum, super cuius prefixione uobis damus tenore presencium potestatem. Non obstante etc. Diem vero citacionis predicte et quicquid in premissis feceritis nobis per uestras litteras harum seriem continentes liquide rescribatis. Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum, vij. Jdus Maij pontificatus nostri anno tercio.

(Urbani VI. Secr. in arch. secr. Vatic. ann. 3—5. lib. 1. fol. 16.)

Genealogical Tables.

I. The royal line of Man.

Harold.

Maccus † 976. — Godred, King of Man and the Isles, † 989.

(?) Harold the black, of Isla.

Godred Crowan, King of Man and the Isles, † 1095.

Lagman, King of Man and the Isles, † c. 1096. — Harold blinded 1095. — Olaf Bitling, King of Man and the Isles, † 1153. Wives. 1. Afreca of Galloway. 2. Ingibjörg, daughter of Harold, Earl of Orkney. 3. Concubines.

Three Sons, blinded 1153. (sons of Harold)

1. Godred, King of Man and the Isles, † 1187. — 2. and 3. Reginald, blinded 1164. — Lagman. — Harold. — Ragnhild, marr. to Somerled of Argyll, vid. Tab. II.

Reginald, King of Man and the Isles, † 1229. Wife N. N. of Kentire. — Ivar. — N. N. daughter. — Olaf the black, King of Man and the Isles, † 1237. Wives. 1. Lawon of Kentire. 2. Christina of Ross. — Afreca, marr. to John de Courcy.

Godred Don, King, † 1230. — N. N. daughter marr. to Thomas of Galloway. (children of Reginald, King of Man and the Isles)

Reginald, bishop of Man, † c. 1220. (child of N. N. daughter)

2. Harold, King of Man and the Isles, † 1248. Wife, Christina, daughter of King Hácon of Norway, † 1248. — Reginald, King, † 1249. — Godred † 1237 — Magnus, King of Man and the Isles, † 1265. Wife. N. N. daughter of Eogan of Argyll. (children of Olaf the black)

(?) N. N. (child of Afreca)

Harold, King of Man; went to Norway 1250. (son of Godred Don)

Godred, declared King by the Manx 1275. (son of Magnus)

(?) Afreca, claimed the kingdom of Man 1293. (child of (?) N. N.)

II. The Somerledian line.

Gille-Adomnan, probably a descendant of Gille, Earl in Colonsay, and the sister of Earl Sigurd of Orkney, about a. d. 1000.

- Gillebrigde or Gilbert.
  - Somerled, the elder, † 1083.
    - Gille-Adomnan.
      - Gillebrigde.
        - Somerled the younger, † 1164.
          Wives: 1. N. N. 2. Ragnhild, daughter of Olaf, King of Man.
          - 1. Gillecolum.
            - (?) Somerled.
          - 2. Dugald.
            - Dugald Skrok, King.
            - Duncan, King.
              - Eogan (John, Eugenius) King.
                - N. N. daughter, married 1. to King Magnus of Man. 2. to Malise Earl of Stratherne.
                - N. N. daughter, married to Alexander, great grandson of Reginald.
            - Uspak or Hácon King, † 1230.
          - Reginald.
            - Rory.
              - Dugald, King, † 1268.
                - Sir Eric Dugaldson † 1287.
            - Donald.
              - Alan.
                - Rory.
                - Christina.
                  - Reginald † 1346.
                  - Amy, marr. John Mac Donald.
              - Angus Moir, Mac Donald.
                - Alexander. marr. a daughter of Eogan.
                - Angus = Og.
                  - John Mac Donald (Johannes Mac Dofnald) Dominus de Ile † c. 1386. marr. 1. Amy daughter of Rory. 2. a daughter of Robert the Steward.
                  - John Og.
          - Angus.
            - Three Sons.
          - Olaf.
          - N. N. daughter marr. to Malcolm Mac Heth.

ERRATA.

Page VI.	*line* 19,	*for*	than this fact	*read*	than this
— VIII.	— 15,	—	iu	—	in

Runic Inscriptions in the Isle of Man.

Class A. (ᛋ - *s*, ᚬ - *o*, ᛅ - *a*, ᚾ - *n*, ᛏ - *t*, *no* ᛓ.)

1. ᛘᛅᛚ : ᛚᚢᛘᚴᚢᚾ : ᚱᛅᛁᛋᛏᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛋ : ᚦᛅᚾᛅ : ᛁᚠᛏᛁᚱ : ᛘᛅᛚ : ᛘᚢᚱᚢ : ᚠᚢᛋᛏᚱᛅ :
ᛋᛁᚾᛅ : ᛏᚬᛏᛁᚱ : ᛏᚢᚠᚴᛅᛚᛋ : ᚠ ᚬᚾᛅ : ᚬᛋ : ᛅᚦᛁᛋᚬ : ᛅᛏᛁ :

2. ..... ᛁᛏᚱᛅ : ᛁᛋ : ᛚᛅᛁᚠᛅ : ᚠᚢᛋᛏᚱᛅ : ᚴᚢᚦᛅᚾ : ᛋᚢᚾ : ᛁᛚᛅᚾ :

Class B. (ᛌ - *s*, ᚬ - *o or a*, ᛆ - *a*, ᚿ - *n*, ᛐ - *t*, ᛓ - *b*.)

3. ᚦᚬᚱᛚᚼᚱ : ᚦᛁᚢᛐᚢᛚᛓ : ᛌᚢᚿᚱ : ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᚬᛘᛆ : ᛆᛁᚠᛐᛁᚱ : ᚠᛁᛓ : ᛌᚢᚿ : ᛌᛁᚿ ×

4. × ᚢᛐᚱ : ᚱᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᚬᚿᚬ : ᛆᚠᛐ : ᚠᚱᚬᚴᛆ : ᚠᛆᚦᚢᚱ : ᛌᛁᚿ : ᛁᚿ : ᚦᚢᚱᛓᛁᚼᚢᚱᚿ : ⁞⁞ ..

5. ᛘᛆᛁᛚ : ᛓᚱᛁᚴᛆᛁ : ᛌᚢᚿᚱ : ᛆᚦᛆᚴᛆᚿᛌ : ᛌᛘᛁᚦ : ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᛆᛘᛆ : ᚠᚢᚱ : ᛌᛆᛚᚢ : ᛌᛁᚿᛆ : ᛌᛁᚿ :
ᛓᚱᚢᚴᚢᛁᚿ : ᚴᛆᚢᛐ : ᚴᛁᚱᚦᛁ : ᚦᛆᚿᚿ : ᛆᚢᚴ : ᛆᛚᛆ : ᛁᛘᛆᚢᚿ ×

6. .... ᚦᛆᛘᛆ : ᛆᚠ : ᚢᚠᛆᛁᚴ : ᚠᛆᚢᚦᚢᚱ : ᛌᛁᚿ : ᛁᚿ : ᚴᛆᚢᛐᚱ : ᚴᛁᚱᚦᛁ : ᛌᚢᚿᚱ : ᛓᛁᚼᚱᛘᚱ :
ᚴᚢᛓ : ᚴᚢᛚᛁ :

7. ...ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᛆᚿ : ᛆᚠᛐᛁᚱ : ...   *8.* .... ᚴᚱᛁᛘᛌ : ᛁᚿᛌ : ᛌᚢᛆᚱᛐᛆ ×

9. ...ᛌᚢᛆᚴ : ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᛆᚿ : ᛁᚠᛐ : ᚱᚢᛘᚢᚿ : .... ᛘᛐ ×

10. × ᛁᚢᛆᛚᚠᛁᚱ : ᛌᚢᚿᚱ : ᚦᚢᚱᚢᛚᚠᛌ : ᛁᛁᚿᛌ : ᚱᛆᚢᚦᛆ : ᚱᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᚬᚿᚬ :
ᛆᚠᛐ : ᚠᚱᛁᚦᚢ : ᛘᚢᚦᚢᚱ : ᛌᛁᚿᚬ ×

11. ᛁᚢᚱᛁᛐᛚᚢᚱᛆ ᚦᚢᚱᚴᛆᚢᛚᛁᚦᛁᚴᚱᚴᚱᚴᛁᛚ

12. ....ᚱ : ᚬᛌᚴᛁᛐᛁᛚ : ᚢᛁᛚᛐᛁ : ᛁ : ᛐᚱᛁᚴᚢ : ᛆᛁᚦ : ᛌᚬᛆᚱᛆ : ᛌᛁᛁᚿ ×

13. × ᛌᚬᚿᛐ : ᚢᛚᚠ : ᛁᛁᚿ : ᛌᚢᛆᚱᛐᛁ : ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᚬᛘᛆ : ᛆᚠᛐᛁᚱ : ᛆᚱᛁᚿ : ᛓᛁᚼᚢᚱᚴ :
ᚴᚢᛁᚿᚢ : ᛌᛁᚿᛆ ×

14. .... ᛁᚿᚬᛁᚱᚢᛁᚱ : ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐ : ᚱᚢᚿᛆᚱ : ᚦᛆᚱ : ᛆᚠᛐᛁᚱ ....

15. ..... ᚱᚢ : ᛌᚢᚿ : ᛁᚿ : ᚬᚿᚬᚿ : ᚱᛆᛁᛐᛁ : ᚠᛆᛁᚱᚦᚢᚱ : ᛁᛆᛚ ......

16. × ᚦᚢᚱᛚᛆᛓᚱ : ᚿᛆᛆᚴᛁ : ᚱᛁᛌᛐᛁ : ᚴᚱᚢᛌ : ᚦᚬᚿᚬ : ᛆᚠᛐ : ᚠᛁᛆᚴ : ᛌᚢᚿ : ᛁᚿ : ᛓᚱᚢᚦᚢᚱ :
ᛌᚢᚿ : ᛁᛆᛓᚱᛌ ×

17. a. ᚴᚱᚢᛌ ...   *b.* .... ᛁᛌᚢᚴᚱᛁᛌᛐ ....   *c.* ·ᚦᚢᚱᛁᚦ × ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐ : ᚱᚢᚿᛆᚱ ..

d. .... ᛌᚢᚿᚱ × ᚱᛆᛁᛌᛐᛁ × ᛆᚠᛐᛁᚱ × ᛌᚢᚿ × ᛌᛁᛘᛆ × ᛘᚢᚱᚴᛁᛓᛚᚢ ×

e. ᚢᚴᛁᚴᛆᛐ × ᛆᛌᚢᛁᚱ × ᛆᚦᛁᚴᚱᛁᛐ × ᛆᛘ .. ᚿᚦ ..